

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1879.

The Week.

THE "National Greenback-Labor Party of the State of New York" assembled with great difficulty at Utica last week. The successful organization of the Convention was not secured till Saturday, Friday up to midnight having been spent in discussing delicate points of parliamentary law, in arranging to pay for the hall, and in admitting the proper delegates from this city. It did not appear that these last, of which there were three sets, were any of them "regular" or irregular, but the question at issue concerned the political affiliations of each set with organizations of real importance. The Convention seems to have been decidedly puzzled to decide between these which was likeliest to sell out the ticket about to be nominated. According to the *Times*, which takes a disinterested view of the matter, as the Republicans are not supposed to be involved, a happy result was attained, and "the men who composed the meeting are to be congratulated upon the fact that they refused all the overtures which were made to them by Tilden and Company on the one hand, and Tammany Hall on the other." "Sensibly declining to be the tools of either side," the votes they represent will at least not be cast for the Republican candidate's most dangerous opponent. The venerable Mr. Richard Schell was mentioned as a candidate for Governor, but the honest and horny-handed sons of labor "literally hissed the Tammany schemers out of the hall." Finally, the Convention nominated Harris Lewis, of Herkimer County, and president of the Farmers' Alliance, for Governor, and a full State ticket. The platform is, in the main, the usual greenback deliverance, but distinguished by the addition of some extraordinary resolutions intended to cheer up Kearney "in his heaven-inspired work," charging "our opponents" with being "really the red-handed Communists," and commending Kearney's recent restraint of the California mob from attacking the same. Apparently Kearney's "peace-policy" has produced a temporary transformation of "the Commune," which is altogether the best thing he has done.

At this writing there is still nothing but uncertainty as to what will happen in the Republican Convention at Saratoga on Wednesday, and, as the result will be known before this reaches our readers, speculation about it is useless. Mr. Conkling is said to stand firm for Cornell, for many years one of his leading henchmen, but possessing no hold on the party beyond what the Machine gives him, and the Senator's friends are confident of his nomination, but talk of Judge Robertson and Mr. Starin in case their anticipations are not realized. Cornell was the Naval Officer of this port who telegraphed about the "impudence" of the Union League Club in opposing Mr. Conkling's Presidential pretensions before the Cincinnati Convention, and who set the President's civil-service order at defiance. His nomination for the governorship of the State the year before the Presidential Convention would be perhaps the most striking bit of defiance to the reform element in the party which has yet been uttered. No one believes in his heart that he could draw out the full Republican vote of the State; but we must say there is nothing in the results of Mr. Conkling's past experiments on the party to forbid his trying this one. Vice-President Wheeler has appeared on the scene to oppose the nomination.

The Tammany Committee on Organization has issued a manifesto against Mr. Robinson of the most pronounced description. It is evidently the composition of some one who has had educational opportunities not open to most of the committee, and is not at all in the peculiar style of ordinary Tammany addresses. It is, in fact,

modelled on the Declaration of Independence, and consists mainly of an enumeration of the various acts of oppression and usurpation committed throughout the State by Mr. Robinson. He is denounced as having been "a party to the coalition by which the Democratic party was defeated last November"; as presenting the horrid spectacle of the first Governor of the State who "has abused his judicial power for partisan purposes"; as having "removed one Democrat from an office to which he was elected by the people upon charges so slight that in another case he dismissed the same charges, although resting upon the same proofs." By his action with regard to the Police Commissioners, he has "endangered the peace, the property, and the lives of our citizens, by weakening their chief protection against vice and crime," and he now proposes, "by the appointment of the inspectors of election, to obtain control of our ballots." He has made himself liable to impeachment by consenting to the removal from office "without a hearing" of citizens "who could only be removed for cause." Finally, he is "a Trustee of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York." In fact, no thoughtful person can examine the manifesto without seeing that as a cold-blooded and heartless tyrant George III., in comparison with Robinson, was literally "nowhere," and the only wonder is that the latter has been endured so long without armed resistance. That any section of our people should desire his re-election seems incredible; and yet, as we go to press, the indications seem to be that he has got a majority of the delegates to the Democratic convention under his control.

During the present week the political canvass in Maine will terminate, and on Monday the strength of the three parties which have been conducting it will be shown at the polls. Prediction is as hazardous as it is cheap, and all that can be said is that the Republicans are at least as confident as their rivals. They have put forth extraordinary efforts, and to their home orators, like Blaine and Hamlin, and Hamlin's successors *in petto*, Messrs. Frye and Hale, have joined the leading Stalwarts of the party at large, including Secretary Sherman, Zach Chandler, and Gen. Garfield. The national importance of the election has been insisted on, and in a party sense quite correctly. Maine's example will undoubtedly be felt by the States whose elections come later, and the fate of the Greenback party there will be watched with general interest. In 1876 it polled less than one per cent. of the total vote; in 1877, rather more than five per cent.; in 1878, nearly thirty-three per cent. It acquired this sudden bulk chiefly by swallowing the Democratic party to the extent that it was able; if its capacity has not increased in the meantime, or if it has been obliged to disgorge, its occupation as a party will be gone, and in the Presidential election of next year it will hardly hold up its head. Thus far its existence has profited the Democrats solely, as was no more than fair.

Although he has made no important speech during the week, Secretary Sherman has not entirely surrendered himself to a vacation rest from the active duties associated with his office. He has been relieved by an interview in the Cincinnati *Commercial*, which takes pleasure in rendering justice to the Secretary, of the false imputation of having appointed Confederate soldiers and his own relatives to office; has made a speech to the Cincinnati merchants, disposing of the charge that he had extended the time for withdrawal of the proceeds of the sale of four per cent. bonds from the national banks in order to relieve those institutions; and has made a speech at Lexington, Ky., whither he went upon an excursion arranged in his honor by the Cincinnati Southern Railway Company. This speech had, of course, little political significance, and Mr. Sherman did not improve the opportunity to make any explanations of his official acts or any statements of his personal convictions. Necessarily, therefore, his accomplishment of resumption and the

unreconstructed condition of the South were passed over, and the citizens of Kentucky were instead reminded of the heroic deeds of their ancestors in defence of the infant settlement of Ohio. For this he assured them the people of Ohio were still profoundly grateful, and were trying to make it up to the Kentuckians by building "this well-constructed railroad" through the blue-grass region. Nevertheless he ventured to remark that "these sister States are but a part of a great country," and to hope that they would be "filled with hearts beating warmly for each other in the future." He gave no distinct promise, however, of laboring to this end in his future speeches, when he should be released from the thralldom imposed by the urbanity necessary upon a Lexington race-course.

The Freedmen's Savings-Bank became insolvent in 1874, and special machinery for winding it up was created in the same year, in the shape of a board of three commissioners, at a salary of \$3,000 a year each. We commented on this machinery in 1875, calling attention to the fact that no depositor or creditor was empowered under the law to sue the commissioners on their bond for the faithful performance of their duties; that they were not required to report to anybody; that they were not made accountable to anybody, and that their decisions were final. News now comes from Washington that the "winding up" is still going on, five years after the failure; that the most shocking falsification of the books has been discovered, pages having been frequently torn out, and the index to the ledger destroyed; "but unfortunately," says the despatch, "the statute of limitations will prevent the prosecution of the persons responsible for this mismanagement of the affairs of the bank." This is exactly what we expected. The perpetrators of this immense fraud were the members of the Washington Ring, which grew up and flourished under the favor of the White House during General Grant's Administration, and the Freedmen's Savings-Bank was simply one of several nefarious schemes. It is very discreditable to the Democrats that they should not have followed this matter up and thoroughly exposed it. Of the effect of it on the thrifty and intelligent portion of the negro population we need not speak. When a bull-dozer goes after a black man with a whip or a gun it fills him with bodily terror, but it does not shake his faith in the existence of morality itself. But when a band of Stalwarts get together, and, after weeping over his condition, offer to take care of his money for him, and, having got it, divide it among themselves and disappear, it makes him doubt whether there is justice anywhere on earth; and this is very much what the Stalwarts of the bank did. We warrant that every one of the rogues is to-day bewailing the "outrages" at the South, and shouting for a "steady hand at the helm" in Washington.

General Smith created a good deal of excitement among the city politicians last week by returning from the country and issuing a notice to Messrs. Nichols, Wheeler, and French, advising them of the fact, and informing them in formal language that he was "ready for business." He followed this up with a notice to Mr. Morrison, warning that gentleman that he looked upon him as a "trespasser," and demanding an instant relinquishment of his claims upon the police-commissionership. General Smith is the only one of the old Board whose movements are looked upon with any degree of physical fear by the politicians who are opposed to him. Owing to his military reputation, he is regarded by them as a man of blood and iron, who will stick at nothing in carrying out the programme agreed upon with his "counsel." There were at first considerable apprehensions lest he should appear at the head of a large and heavily-armed force of desperate adherents, and drive the peaceful Morrison and the unresisting MacLean into the street, reassume control of the police force, and awe the city into submission. The reporters seem, indeed, to have been considerably disappointed by his announcing that he merely means to take legal measures to assert his rights. Meanwhile Mr. Wheeler has got into more trouble through the stoppage of his salary. On Monday Mr. Cooper notified the Board that the Police Department accounts showed

Mr. Wheeler to be in arrears to the amount of about two thousand dollars, received from the sale of buttons, and that Mr. Wheeler was not legally entitled to receive any salary until he should make the deficit good. Mr. MacLean immediately called for a vote, and Mr. Wheeler declining to vote, and Mr. French voting no, and Messrs. Morrison and MacLean voting yes, a resolution which practically had the effect of cutting off Mr. Wheeler's August salary was passed. Mr. Wheeler himself, singularly, afterwards allowed his vote to be recorded in the affirmative, an act which he has not explained, and it is believed cannot.

The yellow fever in the Southwest has increased during the week, and in many places given rise to more excitement than has been exhibited since its first appearance. At Memphis there has been a larger number of cases than usual lately, and that the increase is not serious is attributed to the general exodus, which leaves the city with a much smaller population than that of last year. There have been new cases at Mississippi City and Vidalia and New Orleans, and Mobile is quarantined against the last place. At Houston, Texas, the people stopped a through-train and arrested the United States authorities, who were determined to break the quarantine, which had already been "raised"; the passengers were allowed to proceed, but the city still holds the United States officers, who, nevertheless, assert that they acted under the authority of Governor Roberts, as well as of the general Government. The National Board of Health is said to feel some alarm about the situation in New Orleans, but to be encouraged by the lateness of the season and the sanitary work already performed there. Ten thousand dollars have already been expended in the city by the Board, and it is suggested that a similar amount be devoted to purchasing for destruction infected clothing. The fever has struck a shining mark in General John B. Hood, whose death on Saturday is particularly distressing. He leaves twelve children, all of them under twelve years of age, penniless and completely orphaned, Mrs. Hood having also died of the fever within the month. Since the war—in which it will be remembered he was one of the last Southern commanders to surrender—he had been engaged in mercantile pursuits, and had made a fortune only to lose it in speculation in Louisiana consols.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science held its twenty-eighth annual meeting at Saratoga during the past week. This is, we believe, the first occasion since 1860 on which a place of fashionable summer resort has been chosen for the meeting. The result has been a much larger attendance than usual, especially of the older and better-known members, half the whole number of living past presidents taking part in the proceedings. It is also deserving of note that although the "universe-makers" appear to have been present in considerable numbers, there was somewhat more than the usual proportion of papers by eminent members. Still, it is indisputable that the proceedings of the Association convey no adequate idea of what our leading men of science are doing in their respective branches, and we suggest that an attempt at some improvement in this respect is worthy of the consideration of the managers. Possibly a less formal system of organization, such as that of the German Association of Naturalists, would be found beneficial.

Perhaps the most important financial occurrences of the week were the arrivals at New York of gold sent from London and Paris. These arrivals amounted to \$3,100,591; and, according to cable advices, nearly \$10,000,000 more gold in one form and another is now afloat on the way to this port. It was not until late in the week that any gold was withdrawn from the Bank of England, previous lots having been made up from arrivals at London and from outside stocks. Although the Bank of England has a remarkably large reserve—close upon 60 per cent. of its liabilities—yet as soon as the stock in its vaults began to be drawn upon, the discount market immediately strengthened, and where a week ago the rate was one per cent. it is now one and a half per cent. On the calculation that further withdrawals of gold would cause a further rise in the discount rate, the market here for sterling bills, which

had fallen half a cent early in the week, recovered the fall, and bills payable on demand closed strong. The gold which has arrived here in the last two weeks has gone into the Treasury when it consisted of double eagles, and to the Assay Office when it consisted of bars or foreign coin, and in a majority of both cases legal-tender notes or Clearing-house certificates have been received therefor, so that the banks appear in the item of specie in their statement to have gained little or nothing. It is evident that the domestic shipments of currency to the West were nearly offset in amount by the gain to the banks on account of the large gold importations. Every dollar that can be got from Europe will evidently be needed to keep the loan market in smooth working condition during the remainder of the year. Mercantile business continues active, and there is a decided revival in almost every branch of manufactures. The price of silver bullion in London declined from 51½d. per oz. to 51¼d. per oz. At the close of the week the 412½-grain silver dollar had a bullion value of \$0.8643.

There is no change in the tenor of advices from England with regard to the condition of business. The most prosperous mills not only show no signs of paying dividends, but continue to make reductions in wages. The only sign of revival is in the iron business, which is looking up somewhat. The weather has improved, but not in time to save the crops, which are set down as twenty-five per cent. below the average. The tide of emigration to this country among farmers having more or less capital appears to have set in, and small parties are now arriving. Lord Beaconsfield, who seldom opens his mouth on financial matters without putting his foot in it, has offered a sapient solution of the agricultural difficulty which has excited some hilarity among his enemies. He says land *must* always support three classes of persons—the man who supplies money to purchase the land, the man who supplies capital to work it, and the man who works it; but, as the *Pall Mall Gazette* points out, what he takes for a necessary classification of persons is simply a convenient division of bookkeeping. He does not seem to conceive of the possibility of land being of no value to any one but the man who tills it with his own hands, and who would, therefore, perforce unite landlord, capitalist, and laborer in his own person, which is, in fact, the condition of a great deal of the land in this State.

A strong case has been made for the Irish "Home-Rulers," and notably in an article of Mr. O'Connor Power in a late number of the *Fortnightly Review*, where he shows that their plans, however objectionable, are not irrational. The Home-Rulers, too, in their character of "Obstructionists," are admitted by the editor of the *Fortnightly* to have done good service in procuring through their obstructiveness a valuable revision of the Army Discipline Bill. But the course of some of them, and especially of Mr. Parnell, in the vacation, seems to suggest some sort of insanity. He has just been addressing large bodies of excited peasant farmers in Limerick, advising them to pay no rent until they get a reduction, which so roused the crowd that they "stormed" the platform and had a free fight. One of the landlords of Meath, which Mr. Parnell represents, was shot dead at his own door the other day. In fact, the Home-Rule agitation seems not unlikely to take in Ireland the form of an agitation for the forcible establishment of peasant proprietorship, which would probably in its earlier stages be marked by much bloodshed.

The Zulu war appears to be rather suspended than finished. Lord Chelmsford seems to have pushed on energetically when he heard Sir Garnet Wolseley was coming, in order to achieve something decisive before being superseded, and having fought the battle of Ulundi and destroyed the King's kraal, retired precipitately, producing among the natives, it is now said, the impression that his losses were so heavy that he could not stay. He then resigned and went home promptly; the reason being, it is rumored, that he was hurt by the peremptoriness with which Sir Garnet insisted on his giving an account of his movements from day to day. The latter

has had a meeting with the chiefs of Southern Zululand, who surrender and acknowledge themselves beaten, but Cetewayo is at large in the northern forests with a force of unknown size, and it is proposed to try the "anaconda policy" on him by getting the Swazies to attack him in the rear, while the British press him in front. It is acknowledged on all hands that the creation of a government to take the place of that of the King will be a serious matter. Cetewayo did control the tribes, but it is doubtful whether his successor will be able to do so, and anarchy in Zululand might be worse for the white settlers in Natal than the neighborhood of the Zulu army, even when composed, to use Sir Bartle Frere's phrase, of "celibate man-slaying gladiators."

Things in Turkey grow steadily worse. The Foreign Office at the Porte was closed a week or two ago, and the work in it suspended, owing to the refusal of the clerks to go on any longer without pay. Some battalions of the regular army, quartered at Janina, have given notice of their intention to disband for the same reason. In Constantinople itself the representatives of the Powers have had to call the attention of the Government to the increasing insecurity of life and property in and around the capital. The British Minister, too, has had to insist on the removal of the Governor of Erzerum for complicity in, or connivance at, murder, pillage, and arson. The policy the British Government is pursuing of multiplying its consuls in Asia Minor is making more vivid than ever the picture of violence and disorder presented by that province. Nevertheless, in spite of all this, the Turks have actually 160,000 troops under arms in Europe, part on the frontier of Rumelia and part on that of Greece, being apparently still under the belief that they will again be permitted to make war. All this is, of course, very unfortunate for the Tories in view of the approaching dissolution of Parliament. If the Turk would only "pull himself together" and try to walk steadily for a few months, it would be worth any money to Lord Beaconsfield.

It is again announced that the Porte has agreed to accept, without conditions, the frontier line between Turkey and Greece suggested by the Berlin Conference, leaving, however, the question on which side of it Janina lies to be settled by the Commission appointed to draw the line. The difficulty with the Sultan is that Mussulman traditions and opinion require him to yield no territory except to force, so that he waits for the Powers to take him by the collar and drag him out of the region intended to be ceded, in order to satisfy his subjects.

The Pope has issued an Encyclical of great length, showing how, in the early days of the Church, the philosophy and dialectics of the pagans were frequently seized upon by the Fathers and converted into weapons which they used with great effect against paganism itself; how there is no real opposition between genuine philosophy and religious truth; and how in later times St. Thomas Aquinas succeeded in both marking the distinction between reason and faith and "uniting both in the bonds of a mutual amity." The Pope therefore urges on the bishops to cultivate, and cause to be cultivated in every way in their power, "the precious doctrine of St. Thomas" in all seats of learning which they have established or may yet establish, and he adds that this doctrine, far from offering any opposition to the cultivation of the physical sciences, maintains that "the understanding can only elevate itself by tangible things to the knowledge of the incorporeal and spiritual." The Encyclical, which is much soberer in tone than similar documents issued by Pius IX., is only remarkable as evidence that the need of "reconciling science and religion" has at last begun to receive in the higher circles of the Roman Church the attention so long bestowed on it by Protestants. The Pope, however, does not discuss the question himself, or enter into any exposition of St. Thomas's philosophy. He simply presents his writings as the source from which Catholic teachers and writers are to draw guidance in dealing with the special religious difficulties of the time.

THE TWO POLITICAL MYSTERIES OF THE DAY.

WE presume most of our readers are by this time thoroughly puzzled by the place Mr. Samuel J. Tilden holds in his own party, as well as by the accounts given of him in the Republican papers. He has been odious to the Republicans ever since the outbreak of the war, owing to his opposition to it, and, in fact, owing to his outspoken "copperheadism" and his prominence in the Democratic party in this State when it was doing its utmost to embarrass the Government in carrying on the war. During the last Presidential campaign nothing was left undone to make him hateful to all honorable men by accounts of his knavery in private life. He was depicted as a dishonest lawyer, a tricky speculator, a defrauder of the revenue; and an unusual substance was given to the regular "campaign charges" against him by a Government prosecution which was instituted solely for an offence of which fully one-half the men of property in the country had been guilty. The campaign articles, indeed, of some of the leading Republican papers consisted mainly of exposures of his personal baseness, so that before the election it had become one of the signs of good Republicanism to believe all the current "stories" about him. Every Republican reader of the newspapers, indeed, professed to understand the various legal transactions in which Tilden was represented as engaged, with sufficient clearness to be able to follow the thread of his rascality from beginning to end. Towards the close of the canvass the belief in his wickedness had almost taken the form of religious enthusiasm. Many people were satisfied that it was spreading over the whole earth, and that even in the interior of China men shuddered when his name was mentioned. That it had taken complete possession of the public mind in European countries there was no doubt left, for it was announced that foreign holders of United States bonds would sell their securities the minute he was elected, feeling sure that the first act of his Administration would be to take measures for the repudiation of the public debt. Attention was distracted from his character for a brief period during the Presidential count, owing to the necessity of defending the conduct of the Returning Boards, which was severely tasking the strength of Republican moralists. There were even signs of a reaction in his favor, when the cipher telegrams were brought to light. This, in spite of his denials, led to a renewal of the old confidence in his depravity which has lasted until now, and will probably be intensified by the news that he has "unloaded" elevated-railroad stock on his too confiding "ally," Mr. Cyrus W. Field. This act has, indeed, in Mr. Field's estimation, and probably will have in that of thousands of others, an *ex-post-facto* operation, inasmuch as Mr. Field says it convinces him that Tilden *was* privy to the attempts to bribe the Southern electors.

In addition to this wide-spread belief in his moral perversity, there is also a profound confidence in his physical decrepitude. He is represented as a feeble old man, whose nervous system has given way, and whose memory, except for lies, is completely gone. What is more remarkable than these Republican attacks on him, however, is the absence of any vigorous Democratic defence. We do not remember having seen during the past two years a single Democratic apology for him, much less eulogy on him. The Democratic press is for the most part silent about both his defects and excellences. Many acknowledge that there are serious objections to him as a Democratic candidate, and mourn over them. There are none of the usual friendly stories afloat about his love of "the poor man," or the simplicity of his manners, or the peaceful serenity of his home-life, or his legal defence of the widow who was falsely accused of stealing towels when acting as charwoman, or of his love of washing his face in a tin basin at the pump, such as circulate even about General Butler. Nor has he any "magnetism" to boast of. In fact, if we are not greatly mistaken, he is the first man who has run for the Presidency within fifty years whom no one has ventured to describe as "magnetic." No one feels disposed on seeing him to embrace him, or expects him to lend him five dollars, or asks him if he has an apple

or peanuts about him. Nor has Mr. Tilden the "bluff, hearty manner" and the nautical utterance which captivate the crowd. In fact, one of the charges against him is that he is "saving" of his voice, and whispers in the ear of his admirers instead of shouting to them "cheerily," as other great political leaders do. Nor is he great on the stump. He has no fame as an orator. He seldom or never exposes the Republican atrocities in glowing periods. Nevertheless, in spite of all this, he is admitted on all hands to be at this moment the most likely man to get the Democratic nomination for the Presidency again. Powerful as Tammany is, and dextrous as John Kelly is, there is a general feeling that Tilden will get the better of them in the long run. When Tilden is understood to be in pursuit of anything, in caucus, convention, or committee, there is a general expectation that he will get it.

This certainly seems a great mystery, and it is a mystery. It is a bigger mystery, but one of the same order, than Conkling's ascendancy in the Republican party in this State, and they are both useful mysteries, as illustrating the perfection to which the nominating machinery has been carried, and the completeness with which it may, even under the very eyes of the voters, be separated both from opinions and character. Conkling has never had the charges made against him that Tilden has. In fact, as regards money matters, no reproach has, so far as we know, ever been cast upon him, although we feel quite sure he might have erred very seriously in this direction without shaking his influence. But he, too, is not "magnetic." He does not encourage friendly familiarity with his person. He has a far more imposing exterior than Tilden, but it is a cold and repelling exterior, with which no one feels tempted to take liberties. He has a good cross-roads-store or post-office flow of political gossip and "chaff," but no conversation calculated to impose on the plain people with an appearance of "culture" or profound reflection. His forte in the Senate is the thing which plain people most of all dislike and are most puzzled by—"scorn" expressed in "sarcasm." All of his predecessors from this State—that is, Senators who have easily retained their places for several terms—have been men made famous by their opinions, and by their long association with great lines of public policy. But we believe very few, if any, know what Mr. Conkling's opinions are on any subject except the wickedness of the Democrats. Upon nearly every question in which his State is specially interested he has been carefully reticent. There is, in fact, nothing on the surface of his career to account for his prominence, except his readiness to stump in every canvass previous to the expiration of his own term. In all others his health is apt to give way and he remains discouragingly silent. Nevertheless, in spite of these disadvantages, which are, among politicians, usually considered fatal to success in the political arena of our day, he has his own way in the Republican party in his own State to a degree to which no man before him has probably attained. He gets whatever the State can give him in the shape of office without difficulty. He imposes his will on every convention in the matter of nominations with almost unbroken success. Every year there are mutterings of revolt against him, and once or twice the malcontents have ventured to hold meetings and to give open utterance to their insubordination, but when they meet him face to face in the convention they are forced to content themselves with a platitude or two in the platform, about which he cares little. He does not, in other words, care who arranges the toasts as long as he orders the dinner. He is at this moment engaged in forcing the Republicans to nominate for the governorship of this great commercial State one of his own henchmen, who is only known to the public as a master in the art of low political intrigue, as if to show his contempt for the popular talk about "reform" and the popular complaints of the tyranny of the machine.

The explanation of both mysteries is the same. Mr. Tilden has had much more to contend with than Mr. Conkling, because he is not only laden with more personal defects but has had to create his "influence" without the help of the Government; but they are both masters of the same art. Each has created a "machine" to the perfect working of which he attends carefully, and which, sim-

ple as it seems to the inexperienced eye, represents a large amount of labor and ingenuity, and, in fact, may be called a beautiful piece of mechanism. It consists simply in having in his employ, or under his thumb in each district, the men who have the necessary knowledge and skill to see that the right people attend the primaries, and that the primaries elect the right delegates to the county conventions, and the county conventions to the State conventions. At the State convention, having received the reports of his subordinates, the chief takes charge of the arrangements himself, soothes the irritable, humbugs the simple, bargains with the shrewd, prepares for the public the needed amount of rhetoric, and then rings the bell for the rising of the curtain and the exhibition of the final tableau. Afterwards, during the canvass, all that is needed is to supply the people with a certain amount of declamation, showing that whatever may be our objections to "the machine," or however low our opinion of Tilden or Conkling may be, none can deny that the defeat of the ticket at this particular juncture would be an irreparable misfortune; that if the other side is allowed to go on unchecked in its course even for another year, the destruction of the public liberties or the overthrow of the Government will be the probable result; that the machine can be abolished at any time, but that the country must be saved now; that a party is, after all, not to be judged by the character of its leading men, important as these may be, but by its tendencies and antecedents, and that any one who examines these must see that the Democrats will, if successful, at no very remote period reduce the blacks to slavery and repudiate the public debt, or the Republicans convert the Government into a centralized despotism, and put every man in jail who comes to the polls with a Democratic ticket in his hand; that the question before us is not whether Tilden is a good man or Conkling a good man, but whether this last and greatest attempt for the elevation of mankind shall succeed or fail miserably.

THE SITUATION IN AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

TWELVE years have passed since the Austrian Empire, after a disastrous shock which brought it to the verge of ruin, was reorganized on a dualistic basis, and transformed into a constitutional Austria-Hungary. In these twelve years Hungary has proved by her parliamentary life that she represents a nation and constitutes a nationality, and Cis-Leithan Austria that she does neither. Nor are these opposite results of the trial in the least surprising. Hungary's admirable geographical position, the dominant or leading part taken by her strongest race, the Magyar, and the influence of her history of a thousand years, are sufficient to counterbalance all difficulties arising from a great variety of ethnological elements and the clashing of their tendencies. The Magyar knows what he wants, and he rules the state which he has created, defended, and preserved in its freedom. Whether Andrassy, Szlavy, Ghyezy, or Tisza leads the Diet, and through it the nation, the aim is always the same, clearly the same, and never lost sight of; and even the means and the methods employed are not essentially different. Croats, Serbs, and Magyar Radicals clamor and threaten, but they are not able to clog the wheels of government, and still less to turn them back.

In Cis-Leithan Austria things are entirely different. *She* has no natural boundaries, no leading race, no really national history, no common aim, no constitutional traditions, and, therefore, no national statesmen either. The bond created by the dynasty, formerly powerful enough to cement together the most heterogeneous elements, is too feeble now, in these days of royalty in decadence, to counteract natural centrifugal proclivities and antagonistic animosities. Vienna is still proud, it is true, of her Burg and her Kaiser, and her own imperial metropolitanism, but her intellectual pretensions have ceased to be Austrian, and have become German; her aspirations are vague, inconstant, and not sufficiently loyal. The Tyrolese still love the house of Hapsburg, but they love Catholicism better, and the Hapsburgs, now constitutional emperors, are no longer the upholders of the faith. The Czechs of Bohemia and Moravia are

determined to be loyal only as long as there remains a chance of transforming the monarchy into a confederacy ruled by Slavs, and virtually by themselves. The Poles of Galicia cling to the Austrian throne only so far as it offers a protection against Russia, and not without a distinct protest dictated by their love for Polish independence, and their hope of ultimately restoring their dismembered fatherland. Trieste inclines toward Italy, and Dalmatia is a focus of South-Slavic agitation. These aims and tendencies have their distinct representatives in the Cis-Leithan cabinets, and Auer-sperg, Potocki, Hohenwart, and Taaffe, at the head of the cabinets, are far from unanimous in their endeavors.

What has made governing and parliamentary life in Cisleithania possible is, on one side, the influence of the Court, whose wishes are still sacred to the majority of the nobility, of the official world, and other pre-eminent classes, and, on the other, the extravagance of the extremes of opposition, leading to frequent boltings, which have given the Constitutional party a majority over all other shades of the Reichsrath. Czechs, Poles, Tyrolese, and Dalmatians more than once have refused to take their seats in a body whose workings they considered antagonistic to their rights or cherished opinions, and the Czechs, firmly believing in Palacky's "We can wait," have spent many years of masterly inactivity in this temporary political self-annihilation. The heads of the various cabinets have had to bend before the will of the Liberal Constitutional element, which, rooted in Lower and Upper Austria, Styria, and Carinthia, drew also considerable strength from the minorities in Bohemia, Moravia, Galicia, and other provinces, where it set Germans against Czechs or South-Slavs, Ruthenians against Poles, and so on. The foreign affairs of the Empire, which are not subject to the dictation of the Vienna or the Pesth parliamentary forum, but decided by delegations yearly deputed by the two parliaments, have, in the meanwhile, been for eight years under the executive control of Count Andrassy, as head of the common Imperial Ministry. This statesman, even under the most embarrassing circumstances, always knew how to obtain from the majorities ruling at Pesth and Vienna the subsidies required for a policy essentially imperial, but based on the view that Hungary forms the nucleus of the Empire, and that her national interests are to be guarded above everything—a policy anti-Russian in spirit, pro-German from calculation, and cautious from necessity.

The adaptation, however, of this foreign policy to the extraordinary, though by no means unforeseen, events of the last years, called for so much reticence, so much manœuvring and veering, that it naturally led to great dissatisfaction on both sides of the Leitha. The occupation of Bosnia, a necessity of the course pursued, was decried in Pesth as a betrayal of the Magyar interest, and in Vienna as a waste of German blood and treasure for adventurous purposes without a definite object. The support of the Upper-House portion of the Cis-Leithan delegation, added to the majority of the Hungarian delegation, which Andrassy's Magyar eloquence knew how to win, made it possible to run the gauntlet in safety; but the Constitutional party of Cisleithania was split into atoms during the manœuvre, and there was no party, nor any fraction of a party, able to take the helm in that division of the dual monarchy. An entire change of base was therefore deemed necessary by the Court, if it were to go on governing at all. The Constitutional party was abandoned by the remnants of the late Adolf Auer-sperg Cabinet, and a coalition formed before the late elections with the Federalistic, National, and Feudal camps. The Court and the Cabinet threw all their influence into the scale, and the consequence was a disastrous rout of the German Constitutionalists all over the field. The Czechs were triumphant in Bohemia and parts of Moravia, the Poles over the Ruthenians, and Conservatives in many of the strongholds of the Liberals. The new Cis-Leithan Ministry under Taaffe is the first result of the elections. Hungary, of course, remained unaffected by this result of the ballot beyond her border.

The general situation, however, has suddenly become aggravated by the resignation of Andrassy. It is hard, at this distance, to decide whether the many assertions are true which attribute this step

to the ill-health of the Count, or whether to trust the isolated hints that the changed aspect of affairs west of the Leitha, or the new resolution of entering Novi-Bazar, in south-eastern Bosnia, has something to do with the retirement of the statesman to whom the monarchy is so much indebted. Andrassy evidently continues to possess the well-deserved confidence of his monarch, and it is he who, while anxious deliberations are taking place concerning his successor, is still negotiating with Bismarck in regard to foreign matters apparently of grave import. It would be rash to utter opinions in regard to these new apparitions on the diplomatic horizon. One thing, however, is certain: no anti-Magyar policy will be instituted by Andrassy, though he has proceeded, and from necessity may still do so, in a direction not entirely pleasing to his countrymen. An opposite policy must, of course, meet with the stern disapproval of Russia, and there are signs which indicate that Bismarck and his Court are just now greatly out of favor in the surroundings of Gortschakoff and the Tzesarevitch, if not of the Czar himself. While the sky is thus, perhaps, clouding again beyond the frontiers of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, what will be the attitude of the majority of the new Reichsrath? Will the Czechs take their seats, and consent to co-operate, if the Magyar influence continues to prevail in the Delegations and the common Cabinet? Will the Poles be moderate enough to give support to a guarded and cautious management of foreign affairs? Will the Constitutional party reunite and profit by the good intentions of Taaffe and his associates to regain a part of its leadership? Will Federals, Nationals, and Ultramontanes form a phalanx against Liberalism? Will the moderating influence of the Court be strong enough to create unity, or at least a semblance of it? To all this a near future must bring an answer.

Centrifugal forces have done their natural work in Cisleithania. But this natural work has its narrow limits. Cisleithania is bound to remain united, and connected with Hungary. The reason is not of a positive, but of a negative, nature. The principal parts tending toward separation are unable to detach themselves. Separate the seats of Liberal Germanism from its associations, and Vienna becomes a provincial frontier-town, which a Hungarian protective tariff will reduce to beggary. Give the Czechs their dreamed-of independence of the crown of Saint Venceslas, and in a few years they will be engulfed in Germany, to lose their nationality for ever. Release Galicia from the hated bond of union with the destroyer of Poland, and in a month she will be swallowed by Russia. Destroy the union between Cisleithania and Hungary, and the monarchy which shields so many feeble nationalities, unable to stand alone, will break down. All this is felt, though not acknowledged, everywhere. The loud talk is all against the monarchy; the logic of history, the fatality of position, is in favor of its continuance.

ONEIDA COMMUNISM.

DISSENSIONS within and public opinion without have combined to force the abandonment of "complex marriage" on the Oneida Community. This "change of the social platform," as it is called, purports to have been made merely "in deference to the public sentiment which is evidently rising against it," and was formally proposed by the founder of the Community. But it appears that the real initiative was taken by some of the younger members, and the rather artificial excitement which found vent in the ministerial Syracuse Conference of last February may very possibly have been instigated by the same party, seeking to strengthen itself by means of external pressure directed against the obnoxious practice.

However it has been brought about, the event is one of considerable significance in the history of fanaticism as well as of American socialism. The Community, henceforth composed of "two distinct classes—the married and the celibates—both legitimate, but the last preferred," possesses scarcely greater interest than the Shaker sect, and its success will furnish only economic lessons. For what remains of the original conception there is no longer any need of Biblical sanction. It takes its place with all other forms of industrial co-operation, and in the future as in the past its failure will in nowise depend on interpretations of Scripture. That, apart from its sexual vagaries, its example has been wholesome and will con-

tinue to be, there is little doubt. Its growth, if desired, will certainly be easier; but its numbers will now be more rapidly replenished by natural increase, and as its hold upon those born into it will become stronger, voluntary accessions will probably be discouraged. It remains to be seen, however, whether the present compromise between the family idea and the communal, as respects the rights of persons, will not sooner or later be succeeded by a crisis involving property rights in which no compromise will be possible. As in churches the great value of the "plant" is a powerful incentive to harmony and the suppression of scandal, so in the Oneida Community it may very well have operated to extort a concession opposed to the whole theory of its founder. But it would be powerless against a tendency to convert the Community into a joint-stock corporation, with liberty to withdraw and sell out, which would be a logical development of the individualism and egoism now beginning to be tolerated.

That the split in regard to sexual relations has come with the second generation was only what was to be expected. Nothing but a Chinese wall and the adoption of a conventual stringency could have prevented it. But, to its credit be it said, the Community surpasses all its contemporaries in intelligence; it has always been accessible to visitors; its library and reading-room keep it in much closer communication with the outer world than, for example, the Quakers as a body were or perhaps are wont to keep themselves; its travellers and agents went freely throughout the country; its young men were even sent to college. All this showed a sublime confidence in the soundness of its faith, but a hardly less sublime ignorance of human nature or of the scientific basis of civilization. Nothing is surer than that the Oneida system of complex marriage was a reversion to barbarism—to ways repudiated by the race in its efforts to rise above the promiscuous intercourse of the brutes. All the attention it deserved at the hands of social philosophers was due to this fact, and to one other, that it was justified by an appeal to supernatural sanctions. As a cancer in the body politic it was so palpably self-limited that it gave no real occasion for alarm. Its pretensions on the score of "stirpiculture" did nothing to extenuate it on the one hand, or to raise curiosity on the other. A single socio-physiological feature of some importance was grafted upon it, which consisted in the regulation by common consent of the production of offspring.

What is most surprising in Mr. Noyes's message to the Community is his declaration that he did not regard the hitherto existing social arrangements as "essential parts" of their profession as Christian Communists. He has been saying this, it appears, for a year past. But ten years ago, in his work on 'American Socialisms,' he still held to the doctrine laid down in his 'Bible Communism' in 1848, that "the restoration of true relations between the sexes is a matter second in importance only to the reconciliation of man to God," and that "the sin-system, the marriage-system, the work-system, and the death-system, are all one, and must be abolished together. Holiness, free-love, association in labor, and immortality constitute the chain of redemption, and must come together in their true order." Now we are told that the order is of no consequence; "belief in the principles and prospective finality" of complex marriage is still retained, but the institution can wait, and "new wonders of success" are even anticipated because of its suspension. Quite other is the prospect held out on p. 634 of the work already quoted from:

"A Community home in which each is married to all, and where love is honored and cultivated, will be as much more attractive than an ordinary home as the community outnumbers a pair. These principles remove the principal obstructions in the way of Association. There is plenty of tendency to crossing love and adultery, even in the system of isolated households. Association increases this tendency. Amalgamation of interests, frequency of interview, and companionship in labor, inevitably give activity and intensity to the social attractions in which amateness is the strongest element. The tendency to extra-matrimonial love will be proportioned to the condensation of interests produced by any given form of Association; that is, if the ordinary principles of exclusiveness are preserved. Association will be a worse school of temptation to unlawful love than the world is, in proportion to its social advantages. Love, in the exclusive form, has jealousy for its complement; and jealousy brings on strife and division. Association, therefore, if it retains one-love exclusiveness, contains the seeds of dissolution; and those seeds will be hastened to their harvest by the warmth of associate life."

This passage furnishes a timely admonition to the Community itself, to its neighbors, who have just been congratulating themselves on the change of social platform, and to the prosecuting clergymen who have promised a "breeze of general good-will" in its favor. Immorality, apparently, is just about to begin, and the Community's days are already numbered. Perhaps, however, Mr. Noyes hopes that the little band of celibates will save the organization. He recommends a renewed and

earnest study of the seventh chapter of I. Corinthians, for it was Paul who placed "property in women and property in goods in the same category, and speaks of them together, as ready to be abolished by the advent of the Kingdom of Heaven." One is reminded of Father Miller carefully reviewing the texts on which his calculations of the Millennium were based, after the anti-climax of 1843.

Mr. Noyes's compulsory retreat from a fundamental position strikingly exhibits the weakness of communism. The uniform lesson of the socialist wrecks with which the pages of his History are strewn is, that the strength of a community is in its founder; that if he has executive ability the organization may endure as long as his powers are unimpaired, but that it seldom survives him. Mr. Noyes has, we conceive, outlived his headship. His successor, who should be the Community as a whole, competent to maintain its principles and its business, is the self-appointed head of the party which has become dissatisfied with complex marriage. In other words, there is no real succession. A revolution has taken place: the Community as it was has suffered a mutilation which practically destroys its identity, and will by the coming historian be added to the list of extinct Utopias. Meantime, all must wish well to the industrial experiment from which "everything audacious" has been eliminated.

THE FAILURE OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

LONDON, August 6, 1879.

OUR Indian Empire has at last attracted the attention of the nation. Hitherto the most of us have been content to accept it as "the brightest jewel" in the crown of our constitutional monarchy, and to think no more about it. Knowing nothing of the subject in detail, and repelled by its dryness and difficulty, we cheerfully acquiesced in the official assurances that all was well. As a matter of fact, we knew that blight and corruption had hitherto followed in the wake of despotic governments; that it is of the very essence of such governments to substitute the caprices of individual will for fixed principles of law and equity; that under their shadow intellectual and political capacity are subjected to an inevitable eclipse; that the longer they endure the worse they become. We knew all this, I say, but it never occurred to us to apply our knowledge to India. There we calmly assumed that a sort of political miracle was being worked for our special advantage. A divine commission had been entrusted to us to spread "the blessings of British rule" in India, and we were doing it. In carrying out this divine work an Englishman here and there might have wandered from the strict path of rectitude, but the national heart was in the right place. The natives could not fail to see this and rejoice. It never occurred to us to remember that the rule we had set up in India belonged to the worst order of despotism. There is in despotism no vitality, no progressive power, even when the ruling authority is one in race and language with those over whom it rules. But in India the rulers were a race of aliens divided from their subjects by language, by religion, by manners and customs. There, of necessity, the absence of private friendships, of intermarriage, of familiar social intercourse, prevented any mitigation of the asperity of arbitrary rule. We chose to ignore all these hard facts on the strength of certain vague feelings of benevolence towards India of which we were conscious in ourselves. And thus it has come about that after a century of English rule, carried on to a ceaseless chorus of self-congratulations, we find these effects resulting: a profound gulf existing between rulers and ruled; a peasantry sunk in poverty and indebtedness, and swept away in millions by periodical famines; an increasing debt, an exhausted exchequer, and other indications of an impending collapse. These ugly facts have at last succeeded in forcing the knowledge of their existence upon the nation, and hence the general anxiety and increasing interest about India.

So far our failure to govern India well has been well-nigh complete. We may improve in the future, but we shall not do so unless we not only frankly acknowledge that we have failed, but discern *why* we have done so. I am not hopeful that we shall succeed in discerning the *why* before we have been tried by many bitter experiences. We have failed in India because we undertook a task beyond the compass of human capacity. We were not content to plant principles in the native mind, and allow them to develop in virtue of their inherent vitality; we—that is, a few thousand Englishmen—imagined that we could fulfil the functions of an earthly Providence towards two hundred millions of human beings. The natives were to deliver themselves into our hands like so many corpses, and we were to regenerate them. If in future we succeed, where hitherto we have failed, it can only be by withdrawing from the direct government of the larger part of our Indian Empire. It is frequently remarked that,

while in the independent states eminent men rise up in abundance, such as Sir Salar Jung, Sir Dinkur Rao, Sir Mahdara Rao, and others, no such able men are to be found in British India. The reason is obvious: there is no career for them. Our system starves all native ambition and ability till they perish of inanition. Thus there exists in the body of the people neither the energy, nor the knowledge, nor the intellectual capacity to bear up against and rectify the blunders of the officials. What is needed in India is a rekindling of national life in the people, and this can be accomplished only by emancipating them from the east-iron bureaucracy which holds them in its grip. British rule properly so-called will have to be limited to the rich provinces lying on the sea-coast. The people of these provinces are incapable of standing alone on account of their military rule. The rest of the countries will gradually have to be formed into tributary states having relations with the paramount power not dissimilar to those which formerly attached Servia and Rumania to the Porte.

I need not say that to suggest such a system in England at present would be to excite incredulity and contempt. The set of opinion, for the moment, is rather the other way. The Indian Government, conscious that it has forfeited the confidence and affection of the natives, regards with fear and antipathy any reliefs of freedom which are still possessed by them. It desires to extinguish native states, not to call new ones into existence. We are all familiar with this phase of feeling in despotisms which are beginning to be found out. The instinct of self-preservation impels them to make a solitude and call it peace. But, should we revive the policy of Lord Dalhousie, and begin absorbing the native principalities of India, we should merely hasten the day for the carrying out of the opposite policy. For we have failed to administer India because the work was too vast for our powers: if, then, we extend our direct rule over large additional tracts of country our failure in this respect will be rendered still more conspicuous. We shall be compelled to allow the natives to govern from lack of time and strength to discharge ourselves the routine of administration. But these are generalities, and it will perhaps interest your readers if I state precisely some of the defects and difficulties which beset British rule in India.

First and foremost, then, is the want of what Mr. Arnold would call "sweetness and light" in the governing classes. We, with our usual placid assurance, like to speak of British rule in India as an "enlightened despotism." It would be more correct did we call it a "benighted despotism," for benighted it is in a manner which an American or a European will find it hard adequately to appreciate. But contrast for a moment the conditions under which government is carried on in a country, say, like England and in India. In England, upon any political question, a flood of light from all points of the compass is poured in upon the politician who proposes to deal with it. He is, perhaps, in greater danger of being blinded by excess of light than of missing the right solution by reason of the obscurity. A question does not become a subject for legislative action until it has, so to speak, been threshed out by historians, philosophers, and people of practical experience. Only when the utterances of all these people have leavened the public mind, and not only prepared the way for change but indicated almost the precise character of the change that is to be made, does the legislator step in to give legislative expression to the wishes of the majority. Thus there is no violent rupture between the old and the new; no interests are unjustly sacrificed from undue haste and ignorance, and time is given to those affected by the new law to adapt themselves to the novel conditions. But in India we have no class of trained thinkers. Our practical men have, in such spare moments as they can redeem from official duties, to do their own thinking. They have to legislate on a multitude of obscure and difficult questions, unenlightened by public opinion and unrestrained by it. Not that they shrink from undertaking these vast responsibilities; it is the effect of irresponsible power to produce an undue amount of self-confidence in those who are possessed of it. A more commonplace body of men than our Indian civilians it would be hard to bring together. Many of them are, of course, downright stupid. Few, very few indeed, are men of liberal views or extensive knowledge; but each, within a certain sphere of action, is an irresponsible despot. As he rises in the service this sphere enlarges, and it is not in human nature—at least, not in human nature as exhibited in an Indian civilian—to doubt that his legislative wisdom increases in proportion to his authority. The consequence is that when a civilian has become a member of Council or the ruler of a province he generally regards himself as a being of quite exceptional wisdom. He would be willing at the shortest notice to take command of the Channel fleet or perform an operation for stone. Of course, legisla-

tive innovations of the widest character are as child's play to him. He fearlessly rushes in where angels would fear to tread. "During long years" (to quote a writer on this subject), "in the remote jungle, he elaborates some mysterious scheme which is to inaugurate the Golden Age. No carping criticism ever visits the tender plant with its rude air, and it grows broad and fair in the garden of the soul. Little do some of our English thinkers know what effects their thoughts produce. A casual seed wafted to some remote station germinates in the mind of a man who will some day have the opportunity of applying it (long after it has been modified or rejected by its author) to a state of society for which it was never intended." This is perfectly true. The English civilians have treated India as a *corpus vile* delivered over to them for purposes of experimental legislation. A rapid succession of rulers has resulted in a rapid succession of experiments. Each new governor has, as it were, pulled up the legislative saplings planted by his predecessor, examined their roots, pronounced them to be without vital sap, and on the clearance thus effected begun planting his own, to meet a few years afterwards the same fate. The absence of all continuous purpose or fixed principles in our administration of India has been a main cause of its present unhappy condition.

The war in Afghanistan which has just terminated is a remarkable illustration of this. Since the fatal retreat from Kabul it had been held as a kind of axiom in Indian politics that we should abstain from all direct participation in the internal politics of Afghanistan. There had, however, always been a section of our Indian administrators who had rejected this axiom, and at every movement of the Russians in Central Asia had shrieked out that the Empire was lost if we did not hasten to seize Afghanistan. Suddenly the whirligig of time places these men in a position which enables them to convert their theories into action, and in a month the fruits of forty years of a policy of conciliation are destroyed. The warning voice of Lord Lawrence—perhaps the greatest Englishman that India has made known—is no more regarded than that of an infant crying for a light. Afghanistan is invaded; an old and faithful ally hunted to death; all the old crimes, all the old blunders, are repeated with exactitude as if it had been done for a wager; and now, when too late, the very men who urged this policy are becoming aware of the fatal blunder they have perpetrated. Afghanistan, rent asunder by internal dissensions, is fast tumbling to pieces; and Yakub Khan and Major Cavagnari are at this moment in precisely the same position in Kabul as were Shah Soojah and Sir William Macnaghten in 1840. It will be little less than miraculous if the former Englishman succeed in escaping the violent death which fell upon the latter.

Supervening upon blunders of this magnitude comes another peculiarity of British rule in India which has worked incalculable mischief. It is the application of what is known out there as "eye-wash." Many years ago when Lord Lawrence was king he made a tour through the Punjab. Sir Robert Montgomery was at that time Lieutenant-Governor, and his private secretary wrote the chief civil officers at sundry places which the Governor-General was about to visit the following characteristic note:

"SIR: The Governor-General will be at — on the —, and you are expected to have the cantonments in first-rate order, particularly roads, drains, and general conservancy—in fact, *eye-wash*. . . . Sir Robert Montgomery is most anxious about the church-steeple. . . . He is anxious to have it well forward when the Governor-General comes. . . ."

This little note expresses the very spirit and outcome of British rule in India. It is a gigantic system of "eye wash." The ludicrous and ignominious failure of our recent raid into Afghanistan is notorious throughout India. It would be difficult to find in India a single Englishman or an educated native that would not frankly acknowledge this. But it is not for the benefit of the discerning that these liberal applications of "eye-wash" are made. They are for the ignorant public at home. They are intended to provide Indian Secretaries of State with weapons of defence against the assaults of too inquisitive members in the House of Commons. And so the war in Afghanistan is depicted in public despatches as a brilliant success and an immense gain to India.

It is not difficult to understand how profoundly demoralizing is such a system to all who participate in it. Not only is all regard for veracity sapped and destroyed, but the mind loses its hold upon realities altogether, and grows to look upon the administration of a vast empire as a business made up of "cooked" statistics and official reports which are as much works of fiction as the romances of Victor Hugo. The hackneyed simile of the ostrich who hopes to escape from his pursuers by burying his head in the ground, illustrates exactly the attitude of the Indian Gov-

ernment towards the dangers and difficulties which are fast accumulating round it. It has not the courage or the ability to confront and grapple with them; all that it can do is to pretend not to see them, and to utter panegyrics without ceasing upon itself. But incapacity leads, by way of natural consequence, to tyranny and rapacity; the consciousness of failure to an abject terror of criticism. The administration of Lord Lytton is a conspicuous illustration of this. It will be remembered hereafter as that period of our rule in India when all its special shortcomings were exhibited in the greatest perfection. Never before has the Government been so transparently false, never so cruel and rapacious. These are bitter words, but in my next letter I think I shall justify them abundantly. The "Famine in the North-west Provinces," which occurred during the winter of 1877-8, is an occurrence virtually unknown in Europe. This story, if you can allow me space, I will relate in my next letter.

Correspondence.

THE FUTURE VALUE OF LAND IN ENGLAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of July 24 you quote Mr. Bright as saying in Parliament, in the debate which led to the appointment of a commission to investigate the causes and remedy for the agricultural depression in England, "It would increase the price of land all over the country if you would abolish all ancient and stupid and mischievous legislation by which it is embarrassed in every step you take in dealing with land." In the same discussion Mr. Chaplin said: "The least price at which American food, including cost of freight and transport, can be supplied there (in England) with profit to the importer," will in future control the price of food. This last proposition, under a continuance of free-trade, is self-evident; but how the price of the land, which is to produce this cheaper food, is to advance, when it is now more than five times the price of our land which competes with it, is not so evident. It has long been a favorite idea of mine that the price of British lands must decline, and that decline will begin, if it has not already begun, when the "stupid and mischievous" legislation by which dealing in land is there embarrassed is abolished—i.e., when the ownership of land ceases to be basis of titles, of social position and political preferment. When English land can be dealt in with the same facility as can our lands, it will be chiefly bought and held at prices on which a fair return for the investment can be made. There are many people and not many acres (as compared with America) in England, and it was but natural that ownership of land should come to be the foundation of the aristocracy when there was but little food importation. But what folly, in this age of cheap transportation, for a tenant farmer to pay £5 per acre per year for land on which to raise potatoes near Edinburgh (as I have seen), when equally good land could be bought here in fee for twice the yearly rent, say \$50 per acre, on which potatoes can be grown and shipped to Edinburgh at perhaps no greater cost, counting fertilizers, tithes, etc., than is required to grow them on the Scotch land. That land, estimated by their rule, was worth thirty times its yearly rent, or say \$750 per acre.

But this is an extreme case. The average rent of land in England in 1851, when it was cheaper than now, was, according to Mr. Caird, about \$6 70 per acre, making it worth at that time, on the average, say \$200 per acre, or probably more than eight times the average of equally good land with us. If we bring into the estimate those favored individuals who are raising immense herds of cattle and sheep on the public domain, without a dollar invested in land, the disproportion will be still greater. Present transportation facilities render such relative valuation artificial, and contrary to sound economic law. It is, therefore, only a temporary state of things which makes it expedient for the present few British landowners to receive say one and one-half per cent. revenue from their lands, and about as much more in social position and political preferment. When a vast estate enables an English gentleman to get his younger sons appointed to civil, ecclesiastical, military, and naval positions for life, with better salaries than are paid for the same service in any other country, he can afford, from a business standpoint, to accept a low rent for his land.

When will the British landowner cease to reap these traditional advantages? When he finds that he can't afford to eat his own beef. He can't now, nor his butter, nor cheese, nor indeed scarcely any staple food, except milk, and cream will soon be an exportable article; but it will take him several years to realize it fully. The American dairyman, herdsman,

and grain-grower are working a great revolution in England, not only in the price of food and land but social and political. The Blue Book which holds the report of this royal commission will, if I mistake not, be gloomy reading for the British landowner and encouraging for the American; for the same causes which are at work to bring English land down in price at a rapid rate will bring ours up slowly, because we have so much, and because as a people we have none of the English land sentiment and tradition. One may almost say that with us certain political and social disadvantages attach to owning land; they certainly do to working it. In England landowners make the laws—and good ones they are, as a rule; here lawyers make them.

English tenant farmers, many of whom are now losing money and but few saving, will soon, I believe, emigrate here in large numbers, and will be a valuable acquisition to our population. Conclusion: Mr. Bright had best sell his land now.

T. B. B.

NEWBURGH, N. Y., August, 1879.

ENGLISH STUDIES IN COLLEGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In reply to my comments, in the September *Atlantic*, on our collegiate instruction in the usage of the mother language your correspondent "K." has given a sketch of the Harvard courses of study in that branch of education. Allow me to call his attention to the gross result of these courses, which is that a man may go through Harvard and yet write only twelve themes and eight forensics, or twenty English compositions in forty-eight months. It should be noted, also, that the forensics are properly exercises in research, statement and argumentation, rather than in the handling of the mother tongue. Obviously this amount of practice is very far from sufficient to make a correct and elegant writer. As for the "memorizing of rhetoric," it is well and necessary, no doubt, but it helps little. In mastering a good English style the great secret is writing, much writing, painstaking writing.

Prof. Child's courses in English literature are no doubt worthy of their fame; but they are not exercises in composition, and so do not bear directly on our subject. Of Prof. Hill's elective in advanced rhetoric, with practice in writing and study of the best English authors, I of course approve highly. But both these courses are optional, while their aim, we are told, is an essential. Whether it would be best to place them among the enforced studies I do not pretend to decide. I should be sorry to see some other branches (Greek and Latin, for instance) less thoroughly taught than they are.

Let me explain, with regard to my comments in the *Atlantic*, that I was not thinking of Harvard alone, nor even of Harvard and Yale alone.

J.

Notes.

THE sixth volume of Freeman's 'Norman Conquest,' just published by Macmillan & Co., is wholly devoted to the index, which, with an un-Teutonic disregard of economy and regard for ease of reference, fills 291 pages.—The preliminary matter to the Beedham-Springer 'List of the Reproductions, both imitation and in facsimile, of the Productions of the press of William Caxton, England's First Printer' (New York: Jonathan S. Green) turns out to be quite double the list itself, which contains only eleven numbers. Mr. Beedham's notes generally quote a part of the preface or prospectus of these reproductions, and afford much curious information concerning the modes of making facsimiles. Most noteworthy are the remarks of Mr. G. I. F. Tupper (p. 23) on the superiority of hand-made facsimiles over photographic, which has at first a paradoxical sound. In regard to Caxton's device, Mr. Beedham gives reasons for thinking the central character devoid of significance, as being, for one thing, not peculiar to Caxton. This hardly seems satisfactory. Has it been suggested that this character might be a monogram combined of alpha and omega?—The *Athenæum* announces that Mr. W. B. Scott is about to make a *livre de luze* of his researches into the history and artistic characteristics of the Little Masters. It will be illustrated by fifteen or twenty autotype copies of their best works. From the same journal we learn of a forthcoming work, by G. W. Marshall, LL.D., of the 'Genealogist's Guide to Printed Pedigrees,' which should prove a companion of Durrie's and Whitmore's indexes in this country. The publishers will be George Bell & Sons. Other new English works are 'Life and Society in America,' by Mr. S. Phillips Day; and a 'Vo-

cabulary of Sea-Words,' in English, French, and German, by Commander Littleton, of the Royal Navy.—No. 81 of the *Zeitschrift* of the Berlin Geographical Society (New York: L. W. Schmidt) contains a review by K. Zöppritz of the most recent American explorations for a ship-canal across the Central American isthmus. A map of the Nicaragua route accompanies the text.—B. Westermann & Co. are the American agents for *La Semaine Française*, a weekly journal published in London, and obtainable here at the subscription price of \$7 per year, or correspondingly for six months. The thirty-seventh number before us bears date of August 13. Its contents are obviously regulated for English readers, and its great variety ensures entertainment. All the fine arts have niches, and the "Passe-temps grammatical," "La Mode," "Économie domestique," "Échees," etc., will attract their respective devotees. The musical critic is Camille Saint-Saëns.—M. Ernest Leroux, a young but very active French publisher, gives notice of the early publication of three new periodicals under the following titles: *Revue Égyptologique*, edited by Brugsch-Bey, Chabas, Revillout; *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, edited by E. Guimet; and *Archives de l'Orient latin*, under the direction of the society of that name.—We would direct the attention of such of our readers as are desirous of assisting in the spread of sound financial doctrine to a not bulky pamphlet on 'The Contraction of the Currency,' laboriously compiled by the editor of the *Detroit Post and Tribune*, and published and gratuitously distributed by the Honest Money League of the Northwest, whose headquarters are in Chicago. The information comprised in its tables is not easily accessible, and the exposure of the contraction fallacy is irresistible. The League will furnish it on application.

—The widow of the late Edward Moxon, the original publisher of Lamb, Wordsworth, and Tennyson, has in her possession a portrait of Charles Lamb, by Hazlitt, which her present circumstances induce her to desire to sell. It has not only the interest which attaches to all Hazlitt's work, but the interest of resemblance to its subject, which in this instance is of course great. At least Mrs. Moxon vouches for its merits as a portrait, and she was a great friend of Lamb's in her early years and figures in Talfourd's 'Memorials' as 'Emma Isola.' The price asked is \$300. It is certainly safe to say that the benefactors of our public galleries have frequently paid a much larger sum for a less interesting work. Mrs. Moxon's address is 34 Buckingham Road, Brighton, Sussex, England.

—Unusual interest attaches to the September number of the *Magazine of American History*. The opening paper, by the Rev. B. F. De Costa, treats of the Lenox Globe, a tiny affair, but apparently entitled to the distinction of being "the oldest post-Columbian globe now known to geographers" or "that shows any portion of the New World," and "the oldest instrument of any kind showing the entire continent of South America," or "that the discoveries of Columbus formed no part of the Asiatic continent, and that America was absolutely 'Mvndvs Novvs,' or the New World." A facsimile representation of the globe at scale enables the reader to judge of the plausibility of Mr. De Costa's conjectures, which to us do seem plausible. A dislocated island near Madagascar he makes do duty for Australia. The second paper has for its title "The Old Stone Mill at Newport—Construction versus Theory." The writer, Mr. George C. Mason, Jr., made a careful survey of this building last October, with a firm belief in the theory advanced by the late Mr. Hatfield in *Scribner's*, viz., that the mill was the remains of a Norman baptistery. We pointed out at the time what we considered the weak points in Mr. Hatfield's argument, and our objections are fully confirmed by Mr. Mason, who convinced himself that the fireplace and windows are part of the original construction, and discovered that, besides the first floor above the arches, a second floor existed, connected by a flight of stairs with the lower, as is shown by the holes left to receive the ends of the treads. Into the technical evidence advanced in support of these statements we cannot go far, but it is conclusive. The fireplace was found to have two flues, one in each corner, which seems most improbable as an afterthought; besides which the southern flue is perfectly pargeted with a mortar identical with that used in the construction of the piers, and with mortar used in the dwelling-house and tomb of Governor Arnold, the owner of the Mill. This personage, who owned a so-called Leamington farm, had resided in England not far from the Leamington (Warwickshire) mill, of which the shape is circular, and the construction (upon arches) as like that of the Newport structure as cut stone can resemble rubble. It is suggested that the latter may have been built to replace the wooden windmill blown down in 1675. Mr. Mason furnishes diagrams and elevations to enforce his points, and his paper is so creditable to his

professional acuteness that one almost regrets it did not appear in the *American Architect*.

—The "Confession of an Agnostic" in the current number of the *North American Review* suggests an interesting question respecting the possibility of immorality in reasoning, or rather, in methods of persuasion. Is it morally right for the opponent of a sect to personate one of its members for the purpose of describing its tenets and results in such a way as to make them distasteful? The so-called confession is signed "An Agnostic," and purports to be written by an agnostic, but it is designed to disgust the reader with the irreligion of the day, and is understood to be the work of a distinguished divine of the Presbyterian Church. Is this a legitimate stratagem of warfare, or is it to be classified with the act of signing another man's name to a confession of crime? Suppose that Colonel "Bob" Ingersoll should prepare an article purporting to be a description of the creed of a Presbyterian by the Presbyterian himself, but skilfully arranged to disgust the reader with religion and bring religious doctrines into ridicule, and should sign it "A Presbyterian," would that be right? We should like to see the religious press discuss this question, and would set so high value, for example, on Dr. McCosh's opinion as to be quite ready to subordinate our own to it. A strong reason for wishing the question decided is that the article alluded to seems to be one of a series, in which the anonymous writer is personating the various irreligious sects of the day in succession.

—The Historical Dictionary of the English language which the Philological Society has had in hand for more than twenty years is at last to be published. The Delegates of the Clarendon Press, in the University of Oxford, have assumed the entire financial responsibility of the publication. Dr. Murray, the President of the Society, has undertaken to edit it with a corps of sub-editors. A first part of four hundred pages, containing the letter A, is to be ready in 1882, and the rest to follow in the course of ten years, if possible. The raw material for the work consists of quotations illustrating the use of all the English words by all writers of all ages, and in all senses. These are written according to a uniform plan, each on a slip of paper of the size of half a sheet of note-paper. An appeal was made in January, 1859, to the English and American public to assist in making these quotations. Dr. Murray finds some two tons' weight of slips accumulated. In the earliest period, where the books are few, the work is fairly done or promised, but in the later centuries many books remain untouched. A new "Appeal" is now issued for help. A thousand readers are asked for to complete the reading, and send in the slips within the next three years. For American readers American books are left. Hardly any have been touched. Dr. Murray has also, with generous confidence in American scholars, left them the unfinished books of the eighteenth century. At least four or five hundred American readers are needed in order to accomplish thoroughly so soon what is thus allotted to them. Any one can help, especially with modern books. Dr. Murray's pupils have supplied him with five thousand good quotations during the past month. But of course persons who have access to original editions of authors of the eighteenth century, and who have some scholastic preparation for the work, must do the most important part of it.

—A few specimens of the slips will give a clear idea of the nature of the reader's work. The earliest slip for any word should give its first appearance in English literature. Thus, the earliest slip yet turned up for the word *castle* is found to read as follows:

Castle, sb., obsolete. A village.
1000. *Cott. Gosp.*, Matt. xxi. 2.
Farath on thæt castel.

This indicates that the word first appears in the year 1000, in the Cottonian Gospels, in Matthew xxi. 2, with the spelling *castel*, and meaning a village. American readers will not get first slips for words of that age; but let them not despair—many words are younger. For *arrow-root* the earliest slip yet made is as follows:

Arrow-root, sb. Food prepared from Maranta starch.
1848. THACKERAY, *Vanity Fair* (ed. 1853), ch. xxxix., p. 340.
They smooth pillows; and make Arrow-root.

This, it seems, appeared originally in 1848, but was read in an edition of 1853. The first appearance of *affinitie* is as follows:

Affinitie, sb.
1879 W. D. HOWELLS, *The Lady of the Arcoostook*, ch. xiv., p. 165.
By some infinitely subtle and unconscious affinitie she relaxed toward him.

A reader of Bancroft's "History" noted 2,000 words suspected of there making their first appearance. But it is not only first appearances that are wanted. Readers are requested to make a quotation for every word

that strikes them as "rare, obsolete, old-fashioned, new, peculiar, or used in a peculiar way."

Agrin, adv.
1879. W. D. HOWELLS, *The Lady of the Arcoostook*, ch. viii., p. 80.
Half the ship's company . . . were there silently agrin.

Ethnic, adj.
1879. W. D. HOWELLS, *The Lady of the Arcoostook*, ch. viii., p. 81.
The cook's respect having been won back through his ethnic susceptibility to silver.

Phrases and proverbs are to be carefully quoted:

Bacon, sb. *To save one's bacon*.
1698. MILTON, *Defens. Populi*, trans., p. 561.
He was resolved to take a course like the soldier in Terence, to save his Bacon.

Form, sb. *To be good form*.
1879. W. D. HOWELLS, *The Lady of the Arcoostook*, ch. xxiii., p. 259.
Your voice was too good to be good form—that's an expression you must get—it means everything.

But sometimes readers will go through a book without finding anything rare or extraordinary. They are reminded that the Dictionary is to contain all words, ordinary and extraordinary, and that a quotation in each century is wanted for every sense or construction of every word. Each reader is therefore requested to give quotations for common words in their common senses, whenever good, apt, pithy, short sentences containing them occur.

Diplomatist, sb.
1860. J. L. MOTLEY, *United Netherlands* (ed. 1968), I., ii., 21.
If diplomatic adroitness consists mainly in the power to deceive, never were more adroit diplomatists than those of the sixteenth century.

—Minute directions to readers are printed, and will be sent to any persons who ask for them; and there are lists of books of the eighteenth century which are specially wanted, and some other printed matter. Considerable correspondence is needed to explain and to arrange, so that the same book may not be undertaken by many persons. Readers in the United States are notified by Dr. Murray that "they will save time by first communicating with Prof. F. A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania, whom," he says, "we have asked to organize and guide the work of our American friends." It will save a letter or two to each, a thousand letters in all, if all volunteers or enquirers will mention in their first note the titles of four or five books which they have at hand and incline to take, so that a selection may at once be made. If original editions of eighteenth-century books are to be had, those are to be preferred; if not, American authors of other date are to be taken. Early books of travel, law, or records are to be sought, in which the names of American objects, acts, habits, relations are likely to have made their first appearance, and, of course, later books of the same kind. We must read the works of our great statesmen, lawyers, and theologians, and of our men of science, as well as our poets, novelists, and historians. The Dictionary will be one of the great books of the world, a standard work for many generations. American authors should be fully represented in it. One thing more. The readers cannot be paid in money. Dr. Murray mentions that he will pay their postages, and will furnish slips for those who wish them. He has copies of a few books to give to those who read them, and the reference-list of books at the end of the dictionary will record the names of their readers. His address is Mill Hill, Middlesex, N.W., England.

—After a long period of inactivity the theatrical world began towards the end of August to show signs of renewed life. At Wallack's a "preliminary season" was invented to afford an opportunity for the appearance of Mr. J. T. Raymond in Mr. George F. Rowe's play of "Wolfert's Roost." His part is that of *Ichabod Crane*, but, beyond a similarity of names here and there, it is difficult to detect any connection between the play and Washington Irving's "Legend of Sleepy Hollow." Shakspeare took a great many of his best plots from the current literature of his day, without putting himself to the trouble of communicating the fact to the public; and it is difficult to see why modern dramatists should not follow his example, unless, indeed, it be that with the modesty of their profession they hope that their own merits may be enhanced by the association with an established reputation. "Wolfert's Roost," however, is decidedly the product of Mr. Rowe's own genius, and it may be questioned whether it is quite fair that it should be fathered on Irving even "in part." The play is of a school for which a name has been for some time wanting, and for which we might suggest that of Rustic or Cheerful Melodrama. There is a designing villain, a damnable plot involving the peace of mind of the heroine, *Katrina Van Tassel*, an act of arson in the first degree, an ardent lover, whose life is supposed to be lost, but who turns up at the end in a transparent disguise as the avenger of the piece; on the other hand, the action of the play takes place chiefly on old Van Tassel's farm, and we are surrounded from first to last by green

grass, and gentle domestic affections, and pleasant fireside "sets," which produce an effect not satisfactorily expressed by the general term melodrama alone. There can be no doubt that *Ichabod Crane*, as played by Mr. Raymond, is a comic character, though it is perhaps open to the objection of being considerably burlesqued. Mr. Raymond is an excellent actor, but he has become of late a "one-character" actor; and for a "one-character" actor to recover his versatility is almost an unheard-of thing. The scenery of "Wolfert's Roost" is unusually good; a better theatrical picture than that afforded by the interior in the fifth act, with the old Dutch farmer (capitally done by Mr. Shannon) and "Brom Bones" for *dramatis personæ*, we have seldom seen.

—At the Park Theatre Miss Marion Darcy has made her first appearance in a drama put down as "new and emotional," called a "Living Statue." Like all emotional plays, its success depends mainly on the acting, though this of course may be reinforced by careful dressing. Miss Darcy is a young lady with whose name we are not familiar, but who may be suspected of being a child of the boundless prairie. English is with her clearly a comparatively recent acquisition; and, though she has made much progress, she has not altogether mastered it. But a somewhat extensive acquaintance with the American stage has convinced us that what the American people care for is not pronunciation, but genius. Such an actor as Mr. H. Dalton, for instance, who plays the part of *David* in "A Living Statue," habitually substitutes "reel" for "real," changes "orphan" to "off'n," makes "presteedge" out of "prestige," and in many other ways shows a spirit superior to rule. It would clearly, however, be a waste of his time to correct such trifling errors, for the audience passes them by unnoticed, and, whatever reformers may think, it will be a long time before actors, who are not paid to do it, undertake to exert an educating effect upon the audiences to whom they play. Governmental aid to the stage is hardly practicable in New York, but it may interest lovers of the drama to speculate upon what the probable dramatic results might be if the Park Theatre were subsidized by Mr. John Kelly.

—Under favoring circumstances the Egyptian obelisk known as Cleopatra's Needle may be expected to arrive at this port by the end of the present year. Already the ponderous constructions for lowering and embarking it, specially manufactured at Trenton, have been shipped to Alexandria *via* Liverpool, while the able naval commander who has, at his own request, been detailed for the work and has designed the means that will be employed, is now on his way to Trieste in quest of the timber necessary for blocking, beds, and ties. Unlike its sister obelisk, the Needle will be brought over in the hold of a steamer, into which it will be introduced through the bow port; the listing of the vessel being overcome by careening-lighters prepared for heaving down on the opposite side, and its sinking under these combined weights being neutralized by pumping out the water-ballast compartments. The operations of unloading and of erecting the obelisk in New York will be the reverse of loading and lowering, and will be effected by precisely the same apparatus. The name of the public-spirited citizen who has guaranteed the expense of transportation is as yet a profound secret, but it is well understood that for obtaining the gift of the obelisk from the late Khedive—an act confirmed by his successor—as well as securing the money for its removal, the city is indebted to the persistent efforts of Mr. Hurlbert, editor of the *World*.

—Dr. Isaac Taylor, apparently undaunted by his late sharp passage-at-arms with Mr. Newton upon the genuineness of the Castellani sarcophagus (see *Academy* for February and March), now offers a fresh contribution to knowledge—"Greeks and Goths: A Study on the Runes" (Macmillan & Co.) Briefly stated, the author's position is this: the Runes were derived not from the Latin alphabet, but from the Greek, more especially the Thracian form during the pre-Christian period when Greek and Goth were in close contact in the regions between the Danube and the Dnieper. By way of appendix we get the theory that the so-called Ogham (Irish) characters are borrowed from the Runic Futhorc. This matter of the Oghams we leave to the professed Celtic scholar, but as regards the relations between Greek and Goth we must protest against Dr. Taylor's total want of method and insight. Not only is he unacquainted with the latest researches into the development of Germanic speech—*e.g.*, Verner's now celebrated essay in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, xxiii. 97—but we doubt if he even fully understands the old-established principles laid down by Grimm and Schleicher. Thus, "Grimm's Law," which is nothing more than the statement of a phenomenon or set of phenomena, is constantly used by the author as if it were a mathematical formula

adapted to solve all sorts of problems. It is, on the contrary, itself the problem to be solved. And then what shall we say of a scholar who writes (p. 79), "The tendency of gutturals to weaken into breaths and vowels is illustrated by the development of the Greek breaths and vowels out of the Semitic gutturals." Does Dr. Taylor really mean to say that Greek breaths and vowels are developed out of Semitic gutturals? or merely that the *signs* for Greek vowels are modifications of the *signs* for Semitic gutturals? If the former, he is uttering sheer nonsense; if the latter, his words are not only intolerably careless, but they fail to prove anything. What has the history of a purely conventional matter like an alphabet to do with the history of speech-sounds which are subject to definite laws? What is to prevent us from spelling "head" "hed," or even "ed"? Yet all the conferences and spelling reformers in the country could not force a single man to confound in pronunciation "head" and "heed."

—Admirers of Sainte-Beuve will be neither edified nor greatly instructed by a work which is being generally discussed by the Continental press, 'Sainte-Beuve et ses inconnues,' by A. J. Pons. Mr. Pons was for some time the great critic's secretary, and thus necessarily informed of many of his master's private affairs, all of which, so far as they relate to women, he here narrates for the benefit of the public, which is thus favored with a long chronicle of the worst kind of scandal. Of all the criticisms of the book the most interesting is probably that of the novelist Zola, who makes Sainte-Beuve's life the text of some general reflections, none the less noticeable from the evident *arrière-pensée* of the writer. "When an author is audacious in ideas and words, and his work burns with the fire of life, then," says M. Zola, "the public will deem him a man obscene and immoral." On the other hand, when, in treating certain subjects, a writer displays "calm and lassitude, drapes his ideas in gauze, and talks of chastity," he is supposed to lead a clean life and to set a good example. Sainte-Beuve, according to Zola, is but one more proof of the fact that a judgment resting upon such appearances is sure to be wrong.

SEELEY'S LIFE AND TIMES OF STEIN.*

I.

PROFESSOR SEELEY has not the genius of an historian. The first of all traits by which historical talent is marked is the capacity for narrative, and Mr. Seeley, though endowed with great literary skill, though conscientious in working up his subject, and though fertile in theories which, if they sometimes are little better than ingenious paradoxes, are also at times worthy to be called original and instructive speculations, has not the power which, simple as it seems, is in truth a very rare endowment, of telling a complicated tale in an orderly and lucid manner so as to bring into view the main outlines of a subject. Throughout the whole of his 'Life of Stein' readers will find much valuable information about Prussian institutions; they will find many facts about Stein; what they will not find is a history of Prussia or a biography of the great Prussian minister. "Here," writes Mr. Seeley, "the extract must be interrupted, for new matter for reflection is before us." This sentence, if you change one word, describes the whole work: "Here the history must be interrupted, for new matter for reflection is before us." The so-called "Life" is, in fact, a mixture of history and biography, in which the course of the narrative is constantly broken by the necessity of "stopping a turn" to listen to Mr. Seeley's reflections. His speculations are fatal to his story, but they have sufficient ingenuity to deserve consideration, and the fair mode of dealing with his book is to consider it as the work not so much of an historian as of an historical theorist, and to examine with candor and attention the nature and worth of his historical speculations.

Nor is it hard to select from among the views which crowd his pages the theory by which the merit or demerit of his work ought to be judged. The real theme of the book is neither Stein nor Prussia, but the rise and development of what Mr. Seeley terms the Anti-Napoleonic Revolution of Europe. This move is, in his view, something much more than merely the rising against Napoleon of a great European coalition, by which the Emperor's power is ultimately overthrown; for the anti-Napoleonic revolution is, in our author's eyes, the commencement of the great change of sentiment and policy which distinguishes the movements of the nineteenth from those of the eighteenth century. It is the first outbreak of the passion for nationality opposed to the sentiment of cosmopolitanism.

* 'Life and Times of Stein; or, Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic Age. By J. R. Seeley, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge.' London, 1879. Boston: Roberts Bros.

The struggle, commenced in Spain, continued in Russia, carried to its conclusion by Russia, Germany, and England combined, is on this view a new and on the whole nobler revolution, by which the spirit of the French revolution is first met and then overthrown. Of the truth and the worth of Professor Seeley's theory we may say something in a future article. Justice to one of the ablest writers of the day demands that we should, to the best of our ability, state how that theory stands as put forward by its author.

The point from which his work starts, though characteristically enough not brought into view till the first chapter of his second volume, is the Spanish Revolution, which gave the fortunes of Napoleon their first serious check. Mr. Seeley shows how striking this first repulse was, and how difficult in some respects a thoughtful historian even now finds it to account for the sudden break-down of the Napoleonic policy. Spain was the weakest of nations, and yet Spain in her weakness was far more dangerous to Napoleon than the whole power of Prussia and of Austria. To propound the paradox that the mightiest of empires was brought low by the feeblest of nations, and to show that the seeming paradox admits of lucid explanation, is a task exactly fitting Professor Seeley's talents. He finds the solution of what to many writers appears little less than a providential miracle not in any heaven-sent madness disturbing Napoleon's clearness of vision, for his calculations, though daring, were by no means insane; not in any special military aptitude of the Spaniards, for, though Spanish insurgents fought well, Spanish armies were at least as much hindrance as use to their English allies; but in the fact that Napoleon at the head of an empire met, for the first time, with the strength of a nation, and that the weakest of nations has in it elements of force not to be found in the strongest of states which is not inspired with the spirit of nationality. Hence, at the beginning of this century, the marked contrast between Spain and the Italian or German States which had succumbed, first to the revolutionary leaders and next to Napoleon:

"Spain was Spain, but those Italian and German states were not Italy and Germany, but only *in* Italy and Germany. How momentous this difference is we do not now require to be told; it is the peculiar political lesson of the nineteenth century. But it was not dreamt of in Napoleon's political science that the state which is also a nation is an organism far surpassing in vigor and vitality the state which is only a state. . . . The German States, I have said, were only *in* Germany, but the Spanish State was Spain; the state and the nation were in a manner convertible terms; this is as much as to say that all the feelings of kinship or clan-ship were in Spain enlisted in the defence of the Government, whereas in Germany the same feelings had no relation whatever to the Government."

This sentiment of clannishness existed in its highest form in Spain:

"The result of this was that when the Spanish Government in its corruption and feebleness was entirely unable to resist Napoleon, it was discovered that no such consequences followed as in Italy and Germany. When the state fell to pieces the nation held together, and proceeded to put forth out of its own vitality a new form of state. When the work seemed to Napoleon finished it was found to be barely commenced; when he had surmounted all the obstacles which he had foreseen, another obstacle presented itself which he had never imagined. This obstacle was not only insurmountable, but in its total effect it proved fatal to Napoleon's Empire. . . . It is this Spanish Revolution which, when it has extended to the other countries, we call the Anti-Napoleonic Revolution of Europe. It gave Europe years of unparalleled bloodshed, but at the same time years over which there broods a light of poetry; for no conception can be more profoundly poetical than that which now woke up in every part of Europe—the conception of a nation. Those years also led the way to the great movements which have filled so much of the nineteenth century, and have rearranged the whole central part of the map of Europe on a more natural system."

The uprising of Europe against Napoleon, looked upon as the beginning of a new revolution, gives a new character both to men and to events. Stein himself becomes the embodiment of German patriotism. This is clearly the light in which the German statesman mainly interests Mr. Seeley. Stein's land laws, his administrative reforms, his whole action as a Prussian official, fall into the background, whilst his activity in Russia, his attempts to organize a great German movement, his hostility to France, his dislike of, to use his own term, metapolitics—that is, the metaphysical as opposed to the historical or practical view of political science—his zeal in promoting the study of German history, even his leaning toward Catholicism, are brought into great prominence as the characteristic traits of the minister who was at once a reformer and at the same time the unyielding opponent of French policy. What Stein was in practical life that, in Professor Seeley's view, was Fichte in the realm of speculation. The one struggled through his whole career against every kind of policy which menaced or seemed to menace German nationality; the other taught to his class in a philosophic form the doctrine of nation-

ality, and connected the doctrine with the far nobler and more permanent truth that the source of national life was to be found in a true system of education. In his addresses to the German nation "is heard the tocsin of the Anti-Napoleonic Revolution and of all the Nationality Wars that were to follow," for "Fichte proclaims the nation not only to be different from the state, but to be something far higher and greater."

If Stein and Fichte are the representatives of the German revolution in virtue of their full sympathy with national patriotism, the true character of the anti-Napoleonic movement is illustrated by the attitude of eminent Germans unable to enter into its spirit. Much has been said of Goethe's so-called want of patriotism during the War of Liberation, and friends and foes have put forward various theories to account for the fact that by far the most eminent of modern Germans was, to say the least, cool in the cause which roused the enthusiasm of his countrymen throughout the length and breadth of Germany. Goethe's position is, however, on Mr. Seeley's view, not to be explained or attacked as one peculiar to the great writer himself. Goethe's genius made his course of action conspicuous to all men, but he acted and felt in the matter of the War of Liberation in the manner which was natural to any man imbued with the spirit of the eighteenth century, and which in fact characterized the conduct of other men less distinguished than the author of 'Faust,' but still persons of mark in their day. The perfectly genuine belief that patriotism or national feeling was a narrow sentiment, unsuitable for philanthropists or philosophers, and that such a sentiment ought, especially in Germany, to be subordinated to interest in humanity, to zeal for science, and generally to the love of culture, was a characteristic not of one man but of one generation. The person who above all others represents in Mr. Seeley's pages the spirit of cosmopolitan philanthropy and of zeal for culture, as contrasted with the spirit of national patriotism and zeal for liberty, is Dalberg, Archbishop of Mainz. His name, never perhaps well known to the English or American public, has now, outside of Germany at least, become utterly forgotten; yet he was in the day of his greatness at least as well known as Stein. Of the fair side of his character the best monument is to be found in these words of Humboldt:

"I have a really strong wish to see Dalberg's character—which . . . was quite unique in his age—rescued from oblivion and depicted for posterity. . . . He must be shown, where he was really unique, in the great nobleness of his feelings and views, the infinite grace, the susceptible temperament, the inexhaustible abundance in provocatives to ideas, even if ideas did not actually come out of them (whence also came his wit), in his freedom from all petty considerations."

The history of this model of all the virtues (and, whatever were Dalberg's defects, he was certainly no hypocrite) is recorded in Mr. Seeley's work. The archbishop's kindness, his general beneficence, his pre-eminent success in fulfilling the duties of a paternal ruler, the admiration which he excited in some of the best minds of Germany, his political weaknesses, his gradual subjection to the influence of Napoleon, the mode in which he became a tool in the hands of the foreign despot who oppressed his country, his fall from power at the very time when Stein stood before all Germans as the incarnation of victorious patriotism, are set forth in the 'Life and Times of Stein' with all Mr. Seeley's literary power, and with all the force given by an element of perhaps unintended but nevertheless cutting satire. For Dalberg is in very truth, as painted in Mr. Seeley's pages, the incarnation of that spirit which, even seen from its best side, is clearly as hateful to Stein's biographer as it was to Stein himself, and Dalberg's fall is made to appear not so much the mere failure of a weak man to act up to his own ideal, as the moral defeat of mere philanthropy and love of culture by the new-born spirit of national patriotism.

STICKNEY'S TRUE REPUBLIC.*

MR. STICKNEY'S book is one that will set people thinking more and more on the present defects of parliamentary government, not in the United States only but all over the world. He describes these defects, by the aid of illustrations both from English history and from our own, with great clearness and vigor. Every man who takes any interest in politics knows what they are, though probably few could have made out the list with Mr. Stickney's terseness and incisiveness. Parliamentary government has been converted into party government, and party has become a combination not for the promotion of certain legislative measures, but for the purpose of effecting a new distribution of the offices. This is true in a certain degree of England, though the disease is there kept down by fixity of tenure in the subordinate places in the public service,

* 'A True Republic. By Albert Stickney.' New York: Harper Bros. 1879.

and by the infrequency of parliamentary elections. But the efficiency of the Government is, as has often been remarked, seriously interfered with by the dependence of the ministry on its success in retaining a party majority in the House of Commons, and by the fact that members of the Cabinet have to pass a large part of the time which should be devoted to purely executive duties in defending themselves in debate against party attacks. In the United States the perversion of party has, as every one knows, reached the dimensions of a plague, all offices being held for short terms, and being offered as prizes for party success at the polls, with the result that "politics" has ceased to be a name for the aggregate of public affairs, and denotes simply speculation as to the probable results of the next State or Federal election. When a man is "talking politics" he is not discussing any question affecting the public welfare; he is discussing the chances for office of certain persons. A "politician" is not a legislator, or a jurist, or an economist, or a financier; he is simply a man who is skilful in carrying elections, or who has the means of foretelling how elections will go. In fact, parties are completely divorced from measures of all kinds. No party, when it comes into power, is expected to embody in legislation any of the ideas embodied in its platform. The platform is simply a manifesto intended to help in carrying the election, but to which no one thinks of referring after the election is over. So, too, the man skilful in electioneering has become the mighty man of our time. He may be grossly ignorant of everything a legislator ought to know, and be utterly untrustworthy in private life, but at conventions and caucuses he has the bearing of a great ruler, and treats the wisest heads in the nation, the most skilful specialists, the clearest thinkers, and most experienced administrators, with a sort of good-natured contempt. In fact, about election time the most authoritative voices in the land, those of which the ring is loudest, and which are most eagerly listened to, often come from persons with whom a respectable man does not care to have any dealings in business, and to whose opinion on any public concern no serious-minded man would think of giving five minutes' attention.

The disease, too, has worked down into all classes of the people. Most men under fifty, and the great body of foreigners who have come to the country since 1850, firmly believe that free government means frequent elections, and that the more elections there are the better the government must be. When the rich and well-to-do, too, are reproached, as they so often are in the newspapers, with not giving more time to their political duties, what is meant is, not that they are not sufficiently interested in the trade and commerce of the country, or in its revenue, or in its administration of justice, or its foreign relations, and do not discuss them enough, but that they do not go more constantly to caucuses to help to nominate people for office, and are not more industrious in getting voters to vote candidates into office. Two-thirds, too, of the editorial space of the newspapers is taken up either with extravagant praise or blame of candidates, and with spreading stories or views of political opponents which will be likely to affect the election which is always near at hand. The evil, which would have proved a serious burden for a small agricultural community with idle winters, like that which fought the Revolutionary War, has become an intolerable burden for a rich, busy community like that of our day, with a vast population, and a trade, commerce, and manufactures which are assuming gigantic proportions. Mr. Stickney only speaks the thoughts of thousands of patriotic men when he asks how much longer the country can be governed by such machinery.

The changes Mr. Stickney suggests will probably be considered startling by most of his readers, though they consist of nothing more than the application to public business of the principles and methods by which private business is carried on. He would have the President or chief executive officer and the legislature elected by popular suffrage, but nobody else. The President should appoint heads of departments, and they their subordinates. All officers should hold office during good behavior, and their superiors should be charged with the duty of removing them when incompetent. Even the President would be removable in like case, by the legislature, on a two-thirds vote. The legislators, too, should hold office during good behavior; and it is shown by an examination of the terms of the judges that this would amount in practice to about twelve years' tenure—that is, that in about every twelve years the legislature would be entirely renewed, inasmuch as a man would not generally be elected to such an important office as that of a legislator would then be, until he had reached, or nearly reached, middle life, and had had time to give proofs of capacity in other fields. These changes would, of course, make elections rare, or would, at all events, put an end to electioneering as a

profession, and compel men in public life to give attention to public questions.

In support of his plan Mr. Stickney points out that parties, except at very great crises, occupy themselves simply with office-getting; that office-holding for short terms makes every office-holder, from the President down, perforce a professional electioneering agent; that the fact that his place will be vacant at a certain date creates a great army of competitors for it, who seek it also through electioneering; that this same knowledge that he has not long to serve makes everybody, including the office-holder himself, indifferent to the manner in which he discharges his duties, and weakens the sense of responsibility; that it prevents, for like reasons, the presence in our legislatures of the only men who are competent for legislative work, and deprives the public business of the benefit of the experience of the most experienced men of the nation; that the passion for short terms is a tradition of the period when the main business of legislative assemblies was to fight the crown and resist its exactions, and when constituents were in constant fear of their members selling them out or joining the court party; but it is absurd now, when the sole duty of the legislature is to see that public affairs are properly administered and supply machinery therefor.

We cordially recommend the book to the perusal of those to whom politics is a serious subject. We can hardly call it a plan of reform, because the chance of any adoption of its suggestions is too remote; but it is certainly an excellent and important contribution to the body of grave, we will not say alarmed, reflection which the present working of party government in the United States is causing among all classes and conditions. If the changes it recommends were surer of serious popular consideration we should perhaps indulge in detailed criticism. As it is we shall confine ourselves to remarking that the author ignores one of the most effective causes of the evils he combats, namely, the passionate ambition for political office by which the bulk of men in every community are animated. It is this which does most to make party government what it is. It is this which prevents the administration of any government on a purely business basis. As a matter of fact men do not desire good government pure and simple; they desire as much good government as is consistent with the gratification of their personal ambition, or vanity, or self-interest, or love of their friends, and with their desire to see their enemies humiliated or foiled, and their prophecies, whether of good or evil, fulfilled. The idea that government is business, a most serious business, has lost much of any hold it ever had on the popular mind. To restore it to its proper place among political ideas may seem a long and difficult task, but it is the one to which American reformers must now address themselves, and there is nobody but will feel encouraged about it by the strong and hopeful tone of Mr. Stickney's book, coming, as it does, from a professional man, who has no interest in the subject but that of love of his country.

FROUDE'S CÆSAR.*

MR. FROUDE'S 'Cæsar' shows all his excellences and all his defects as an historian. That he is the most graphic and brilliant of the historians of the day will probably be conceded by all; that he has a genuine historical sense—a capacity to see clearly and appreciate the leading ideas of a period, and to trace their relations—is, we think, no less true, and we shall endeavor to point out his substantial merits in this regard in the work before us. But these high excellences are joined with a carelessness of statement, and a laxity in weighing evidence, that make it impossible to trust him as an historian should be trusted. The historical sense is not enough; it is only a *capacity*. The person who possesses it is able, when he is sure of his facts, to combine those facts into an instructive picture. But without the most painstaking study of the evidence, his combinations will be nothing but possibilities, or at best probabilities; he must have also the industry of the antiquarian joined to a power of clear, logical reasoning, and a conscientious devotion to truth for its own sake; all these qualities are necessary to convert his probabilities into certainties.

Now, Mr. Froude's inaccuracy is, after all that has been said, a constant surprise. One can hardly read a page without questioning some statement—as overdrawn or distorted, even if not positively untrue. To be sure, these errors are often slight, and generally about unessential points of detail, so as not to interfere with the general correctness of his views; nevertheless, when we find that a writer is habitually inaccurate

* 'Cæsar: A Sketch. By James Anthony Froude, M.A., formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.' New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879. 8vo. pp. 550.

rate in trifles, we cannot know where it is safe to follow him. He who is not faithful in little things will not be faithful in great things. A few examples will illustrate this fault: We are told on page 24 that Tiberius Gracchus "was chosen tribune in the year 133"; it was in 134 and for 133. On page 29 precisely the same error occurs in relation to Caius's tribunate. On the next page is the statement: "All cases of importance, civil or criminal, came before courts of sixty or seventy jurymen, who, as the law stood, must be necessarily senators." Now, civil cases never came before such a court; and at the time in question (B.C. 123) there was only one class of criminal cases—those of *Repetundæ* (Extortion in the Provinces)—that was thus administered. It is stated (p. 48): "the Senate might have appointed him [Marius] Dictator, but would not." But the Senate had no power to appoint a dictator, this was exclusively the function of the consul (or magistrate with *imperium*); only once (B.C. 217), in the absence of the consul, a dictator was irregularly elected by the people. It is said (p. 82) that, after the battle of the Colline Gate (Nov., 82), "Sertorius fled to Spain"—where he had been already several months; if he had been still in Italy, perhaps Sulla would not have gained so easy a victory. We read (p. 127) "Cicero was prætor this year, and was thus himself a senator." But a seat in the Senate was given by the quaestorship, which office Cicero had held nine years before (B.C. 75). On page 138, "he [Cæsar] had not aspired to the tribunate." Of course not, for he was a patrician of the bluest blood, and the tribunate could be held by none but plebeians. When Cæsar presents himself for the chief pontificate, he is said (p. 140) to aspire to be "Pope of Rome"—as if the two dignities had anything in common but their name and their exercise of ecclesiastical functions.

But, in spite of all this blundering, Mr. Froude has made a sketch which is generally correct, not merely in its outlines (the main facts are, of course, undisputed) but in its leading conceptions. Perhaps there is no better—there certainly is no more graphic—sketch of the misgovernment of the Senate and the aspirations of the popular party. The leading politicians, too, are well depicted, except where the writer's eagerness to vindicate Cæsar makes him partial in his judgments; Marius, for example, Cæsar's uncle and the leader of his party, is systematically whitewashed, while Lucius Lucullus, no doubt a thorough aristocrat and pleasure-lover, is, wholly without evidence, represented as being the venal commander described by Cicero in the thirteenth chapter of his oration for the Manilian Law. And, whether he is always right or not, the observations of a man like Mr. Froude upon the fall of the Roman Republic must be worth reading. As to the main purpose of the book, to depict Cæsar as the greatest man of history, and his work as an indispensable and beneficent one, we shall perhaps not differ from Mr. Froude, except in certain limitations. He himself says, in his preface, that "the materials do not exist for a portrait which shall be at once authentic and complete"; much less, then, for a complete survey of his career and work. That Cæsar, as a man, deserves on the whole the praise which Mr. Froude gives him, we have no doubt. As to his work—the conversion of the Republic into an Empire—a distinction must be made. It is not difficult to show that the Roman republic had outgrown its constitution; that stands confessed. It is not merely that the city type was not adapted to the administration of a world-empire; the city constitution itself had long ceased to develop with the growth of the city. The history of the Roman constitution is the history of a series of compromises, by which the most fatal defects were superficially glossed over; new needs were not met by large and statesmanlike measures, but by cheap devices which would help over the immediate crisis, yet would not guard against future mischiefs. The old bottle was made to serve for the new wine, and repeated patching did not prevent its bursting at last. To mention only two of the most glaring cases—what large state could endure a magistracy armed with a medley of powers so enormous and so irresponsible as those of the tribunate; or to have its chief executive authority capriciously distributed among a varying number of consuls, proconsuls, prætors and proprætors? The constitution imperatively needed to be reformed; some systematization and concentration of the powers of government was indispensable; and perhaps the form chosen by Cæsar was the best, as it was certainly the most natural outgrowth of the national institutions. This was, as Mr. Froude very well expresses it (p. 539), "the transfer of the administration from the Senate and annually elected magistrates to the permanent chief of the army"; only he here narrows the scope of the title *imperator* by conceiving it as exclusively military; he should have said, "to a single permanent magistrate."

But this is not an adequate description of the Roman Empire as it existed, nor have we in any sense a right to make Julius Cæsar responsi-

ble for the institutions established by his nephew. It is a notorious fact that Augustus was a conservative in temper and policy, and that his sympathies—so far as so absolutely selfish a politician can be said to have had any—were not with the revolution by which he obtained his throne. As we said before, our materials are too scanty to warrant us in passing an absolute judgment upon the work and aims of Cæsar; but so far as we do attempt this, we must look simply at what he did, not at what was done by those who came after him. The whole question of the *rightfulness* of Cæsar's rule—as distinguished from its usefulness—depends upon his responsibility in opening the civil war; a question full of delicate and difficult constitutional points, but in which it seems on the whole agreed that the blame is fully as much with his antagonists as with him. This granted, his subsequent career can hardly be called unconstitutional or abnormal. He died before he had completed his work, but all his reforms, all his constitutional changes, were made in due constitutional form. We are apt to forget that the ancient method of revising constitutions was not to call a convention, or even to lay the proposed scheme before a deliberative assembly, but to invest a single man (as Solon or Sulla) or a commission (as the Decemvirs and the Triumvirs) with authority, not merely to draw up a plan of government, but actually to take possession of the government, superseding the ordinary functionaries, and thus themselves to set in operation the machine which they had constructed. This is, to all intents and purposes, what Cæsar did. To be sure, he converted an effete republic into an hereditary monarchy; but this he did by virtue of powers explicitly conferred upon him, and it by no means follows that his monarchy would have been less free than the oligarchy which it superseded.

The fault of most great men and organizers is to take too much into their own hands and leave too little scope for independent action on the part of their subjects. This was where Cromwell and Napoleon failed, and the fatal mistake of the Roman Empire was the same—that it put an end to self-government. This was all the more a crime in that the Romans, by tradition and practice, possessed a vigorous and healthy system of self-government, which the Empire systematically stifled. The concentration of executive authority in the hands of one man was no doubt a great gain; but a true statesman at this crisis would have made it his first aim to revive and purify the institutions of self-government, which had, it must be confessed, sadly deteriorated. "*Omnia erant excitanda*," as Cicero said to Cæsar; and chief of all, the spirit and exercise of free government. Perhaps the task would have been impossible; perhaps, as Mommson says, an "absolute military monarchy was the keystone logically necessary and the least of evils." It is certain, at any rate, that this is what came; that from Augustus to Diocletian free institutions steadily decayed. But it is one of the chief merits of Julius, one of the things that contrasts him most strongly with others of his type, that while seizing the supreme power of control he yet made a strong effort to revive in the republic a genuine internal life. By his extension of the suffrage and enlargement of the Senate he brought into the active service of the state capable men of all nationalities; by limiting the distributions of corn to persons actually in need, and by extensive colonization, he reduced the numbers of the proletariat—that is, raised paupers to citizens; and, above all, his municipal law organized local self-government in all parts of the Empire, creating a system which subsequent emperors suffered to be neglected and abused, but which, even as it was, did good service in the last days of the Empire. It was Cæsar who organized the Roman Empire—the creative ideas of it are his; but it was not he who made it the agency for destroying all free life.

A Ragged Register (of People, Places, and Opinions). By Anna E. Dickinson. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.)—Miss Dickinson's title well enough describes her book. It is a record of her wanderings to and fro in the United States, well spiced with reflections, and it is ragged. We have descriptions of the Yo-Semite country, where Miss Dickinson enjoyed the grandeur of nature and killed with her own hand two rattlesnakes; of New England towns and villages, in one of which she was robbed of a night's rest by a rat drowning in a foot-tub; and of various places between these limits. We have portraits of people who have introduced themselves to Miss Dickinson on numberless railway journeys; who sometimes seem very well-worn types and sometimes very individual indeed; who always engage in discussions with her, are generally uncivil, and uniformly get as good as they send. Of opinions we have a great profusion and a bewildering variety. They are very precisely expressed, they spring from manifest conviction, and they have an air of disposing of their several questions—e. g.: "For me, I

think the Chinese are gentlemen. Let them so stand recorded." There are a great many anecdotes such as one would naturally enjoy telling to one's mother, "for whom," as Miss Dickinson says of hers, "the manuscript of this book was originally penned." Some of them enforce the truth that women are or should be abundantly able to take care of themselves, and that at the same time men should display towards them the chivalry of the Middle Ages, when they were but weaklings; others intimate that there are men still incapable of perceiving this. One of them, at least, is extremely amusing—that in chapter thirty-four. Few political allusions are discoverable, although there is, perhaps, an intimation to be heeded in this reference to the late Thaddeus Stevens: "I hope, with all my heart, that when the dark waters close round us again there may be found such another head and hand at the helm." The book appears somewhat late in the season, since it is too slight and, in a certain sense, too unpretentious for other than summer reading; but we believe success may be predicted for it, for, though it has not the narrative interest of the summer series initiated by 'That Husband of Mine,' it neglects none of the arts of rhetoric in its attempt to be vivacious and, so to speak, serio-comic. The reader whom it begins to depress at the fiftieth page will at least remark that at the two hundred and eighty-sixth Miss Dickinson is as fresh as ever. We would say "flippant" if the word would be understood to apply not to the matter, but only to the style. The style is at times strikingly like that employed so graphically by Alfred Jingle; at times it is plainly Miss Dickinson's own—at least, one is puzzled to tell "where she picked it up."

The History of Co-operation in England: Its Literature and its Advocates. By George Jacob Holyoake. Vol. ii. *The Constructive Period—1845 to 1878.* (London: Trübner & Co.; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1879. 12mo, pp. 491.)—Mr. Holyoake's second volume is interesting reading. It contains a graphic account, enlivened by a number of anecdotes and personal reminiscences, of the various co-operative experiments in England which began in 1844 with the "Equitable Pioneers of Rochdale." There is, as we remarked of the first volume, too much detail, and it is not always well arranged in the several chapters, although the chapters themselves are well sketched and distinct in their purpose. They are twenty-six in number, some narrative, some discursive, some statistical; and chapter ii. contains the substance of a pithy speech made by the author at Rochdale at the beginning of the successful experiment. Chapter vii., "Nature of the Co-operative Principle," is especially worth study for its elucidation of the principles upon which the movement is founded.

Upon a subject like this it would be very weak praise to say that a book is interesting. It is also very profitable reading. It not only tells the story of co-operation in such a way as to carry conviction; it sets forth its theory effectively and cogently, and discriminates true co-operation from what often passes under the same name, as resting upon an imperfect application of its principles. The author says: "Nothing is more astounding to students of industrial progress than to observe, in conversation among commercial men and politicians, the utter absence of any idea of distribution of gains among the people. The only concern is that the capitalist or the individual dealer shall profit. It is nobody's concern that the community should profit" (p. 453). And, as to the manner in which the profit of the entire community is to be accomplished: "Co-operation is an industrial scheme for delivering the public from the conspiracy of capitalists, traders, or manufacturers, who would make the laborer work for the least and the consumer pay the utmost for whatever he needs of money, machines, or merchandise. Co-operation effects this deliverance by taking the *workman* and the *customer* into partnership in every form of business it devises" (p. 77). The italics are ours. Co-operation, as thus defined, is one form of socialism, taking socialism, with Mr. Greg (as quoted on p. 70), to be "a fraternal union among men for industrial purposes, a working in common for the common good, in place of the usual arrangement of laborers and capitalists, employers and employed." But the "Continental craze" of *Communism* the writer wholly discards. Neither does he apprehend any serious trouble to society from it; and his judgment is entitled to some weight, from his intimate knowledge of the working classes.

It should be noted that "industrial partnerships"—the generally familiar type of co-operation—are reckoned here as only partially co-operative. When it was announced a year or two ago that the co-operative scheme of Messrs. Briggs, of the Whitwood Collieries, had fallen through, by reason of the obstinate adherence of the men to their trade-unions, it was lamented as the failure of a hopeful experiment. It is only fair to say

that Mr. Holyoake lays the responsibility for this upon the employers. It had "brought them great gain," he says, "while it lasted," but it was never undertaken by them in any hearty faith, and they were unreasonable in their requirements to the men. This is Mr. Holyoake's view of the affair; at the same time he gives the Messrs. Briggs credit for honest intentions, and recognizes the difficulties in their way. The decisive thing would appear to be that they "were not themselves co-operators," and their relation to their men was always a *patronizing* one.

Perhaps the most vital point in Mr. Holyoake's theory is worked out in chap. ix. ("The Co-operative Workshop"), viz., that in true co-operation capital should be paid only once, and strictly what the use of the money is worth. This payment having been made to capital, in the shape of interest, the profit belongs to the co-operative laborers, with the very important reminder that the higher grades of labor should receive a higher proportion of profit. "The working-class," he says, "are rather apt to fix all salaries at the workshop rate, and begrudge every sixpence over that. For a man's brains, devotion, interest, and experience they award nothing willingly" (p. 127). A second vital principle, that of "admitting the consumer into partnership," was first carried out in the Rochdale store; and in chap. ix. Mr. Holyoake insists upon the same principle being applied to productive co-operation. As a matter of theory it is not so easy to maintain, but he appears to make it clear that it would be a wise piece of policy in production, as it has proved in distribution.

Considering the wide scope assigned to co-operation in this work, and the importance of co-operative productive enterprises, one would expect more than a passing mention (p. 99) of the peculiarly German phase of co-operation, and the Credit Banks of Schulze-Delitzsch; it would seem of the first moment in the discussion. We suppose it is passed over for the reason that this is primarily a history rather than a treatise. In the chapter on "Co-operative Farming," we have a significant expression of Lord George Manners, when he has stated the satisfactory results of a partial experiment of co-operation on his estates:

"Many will shake their heads and say, 'All very well; but if the next is a bad year, you will have to bear the whole loss.' My answer is, 'Quite true; but who can say that my loss may not be less than it would otherwise have been, owing to the stimulus which this system can scarcely fail to exert on the laborer in his daily work?'" (p. 305).

An American correspondent of Mr. Holyoake says (p. 345): "The people of America, I think, are not ripe for co-operation—they have not been *pinched* enough, and the opportunities for individual enterprise are too good." Nevertheless, we wish that this volume—with considerable of its English detail omitted—could be very widely circulated in this country; it could not fail to do good.

Salomon et ses successeurs: Solution d'un problème chronologique. Par Jules Oppert. (Paris, 1877. Svo, pp. 100.)—The author concludes this little book with the words, "We believe that the chronological problem concerning the kings of Judah and Israel is now solved." We are not in a condition to tell our readers whether this is really the case or not; for the plainest verification of the conclusions reached by the eminent archaeologist—so complex and tangled is the subject—would require the labor of months, and the passing of a decision would need either the support of an elaborate dissertation or that of a superior authority. Thus much, however, we can say, not without examination, that we find the author to have applied to his arduous task a vast amount of minute investigation, executed with mathematical precision, and according to the soundest rules of criticism. Of course, he must here and there have recourse to conjectures, but his conjectures are of a plausible kind. His general view of the authenticity of the Biblical narratives concerning the two lines of Hebrew kings may be said to be strongly conservative. He finds it in several important points corroborated, and in no point essentially shaken, by results conclusively obtained from hieroglyphic or cuneiform inscriptions. Wherever discrepancies exist, he thinks the burden of proof, with few exceptions, still lies with the inscriptions, most of which are as yet very imperfectly deciphered and explained, while the harmony of the documents drawn from the chronicles of the houses of Judah and Israel is almost perfect. After having established the fact that, although the Hebrews had an acknowledged era, the starting-point of which was the date, real or falsely reputed, of the exodus from Egypt, the years of the rulers stated in Kings and Chronicles do not coincide with those of the national era, but are to be reckoned from the day of each accession to the throne, and that a given number of years may be precise, or embrace some months less or more than belong to it, M. Oppert by strict computation reduces the whole number of cases in which

the Biblical chronology can be proved to be at fault to the surprisingly low figure of eight. Nor are the errors the correction of which is needed for the restoration of a full synchronistic accord of any particular magnitude. "Ahab did not reign twenty-two years, but twenty-one"; "Menahem did not reign ten years, but at least six months longer"; "Joram could not have reigned eight consecutive years," etc. It will thus not be surprising that the dates as reconstructed by M. Oppert do not materially differ from those hitherto generally given in works on Bible history. The principal of them are: death of Solomon, 978 B.C.; accession of Ahab, 920; death of Ahab, October, 900; accession of Jehu, 887; fall of Samaria, June, 721; expedition of Sennacherib, 700—not in the 14th but in the 27th or 28th year of Hezekiah (the gravest concession to the Assyrian records); accession of Nebuchadnezzar, July, 605; destruction of Jerusalem, August, 587; release of Jehoiachin, April, 561. In order to avoid the difficulty arising from computing months within converging lines of years, M. Oppert uses in his chronological lists an additional column of dates, based on the addition of 10,000 to the years of the Christian era. 9,923 thus corresponds to 978 B.C., and 9,440 to 561 B.C.—the year 10,000 being the same as 1 B.C. There are some sharp remarks in the book directed against the critical methods of over-confident Assyriologists and Egyptologists, and some superficial processes are amusingly illustrated. Of a number of misprints which have struck us, the following deserves to be pointed out as misleading: "*dans le prophète Isaïe*" (p. 68), for *sans*, etc.

Aryan Philology according to the most Recent Researches (Glottologia Aria Recentissima). Remarks Historical and Critical. By Domenico Pezzi. Membro della Facoltà di Filosofia e Lettere della R. Università di Torino. Translated by E. S. Roberts, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. (London: Trübner & Co., 1879. Pp. xvi, 200.)—Prof. Pezzi aims to discuss only those works which treat of the entire Aryan stock of languages and do not confine themselves to any particular branch of that stock. He also says that he does not intend to notice those works which treat of the connection, real or supposed, between the Aryan and the other families of languages, though in fact he devotes considerable space to the connection between the Aryan and Semitic tongues. By the great majority of philologists it is believed that all the languages usually included under the term Aryan (Indo-Germanic, Indo-European) are descended from one common tongue spoken, in a period long anterior to any historical record, by people dwelling somewhere in Central Asia. Prof. Pezzi endeavors to give a sketch of the various speculations which have been put forth during the last dozen years in regard to the character of this primitive language, to which he gives the name *Proto-Aryan*. Of the unsatisfactory nature of these speculations our readers can form a notion when we tell them that they include every variety of opinion between the extremes of those who deny the existence of any such primitive tongue, and those who have attempted to construct a continuous text in the very words which they suppose were used by that primitive but problematical people. The book commences where the history of philology was left by Benfey and Schleicher about 1867. It gives, perhaps, as good an account of what has been attempted rather than achieved since that time as it is possible to crowd into rather less than two hundred rather small pages in rather coarse print. It is divided into two parts, of which it may be said that the first contains the details and the second the general conclusions drawn from them. To the general reader the details will appear somewhat dry, and to the philosopher and man of science the general conclusions will offer the appearance of a set of somewhat vague and wholly unsettled problems. Nearly half a century ago Bopp, in the preface to his great work on the comparative grammar of the Indo-Germanic languages, said, in substance, that the question why in almost all these languages the root *ī* meant *to go* and the root *stā* meant *to stand*, was one which he would not attempt to answer. We are no nearer the answer to-day than we were then. Where he left the question there it remains.

When some years ago M. Wurz made the assertion, in the opening of his '*Histoire des Doctrines Chimiques*,' that chemistry was a French science, he raised the ire of a large number of the scientific men of other nations. But we think hardly any one would venture to dispute the proposition that philology is a German science. We have taken some pains to estimate the comparative numbers of books in different languages cited by Prof. Pezzi, and we find that four-fifths of them are written in German, while of the remaining fifth a considerable portion are by authors who, though writing in other languages—for example, Max Müller in English—are nevertheless Germans by birth and education.

Our own Prof. Whitney, of Yale, of whom Prof. Pezzi makes frequent and honorable mention, although a full-blooded Yankee, is, we suspect, more at home, scientifically speaking, in Berlin than in New Haven, and finds it easier to treat a philological subject in German than in English. The principal value of the present work will, we think, be that it will serve as a sort of bibliographical guide to what may be called the speculative philology of the last twelve years.

Lectures on the History of England. By M. J. Guest. With maps. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1879. 8vo, pp. 582.)—These lectures were prepared by a teacher for the use of her pupils with the object—certainly the first of all objects in teaching history—"to awaken a real and vivid interest." They lay no claim to original scholarship; they are worked out from materials furnished by others, especially Mr. Green, to whom the author particularly expresses acknowledgment; but they fairly deserve the credit of accomplishing what they set out to do. For young people beginning the study of English history the book is exceedingly well adapted. Its peculiar merit is its suggestiveness. It aims, and we think successfully, to interest the reader in the movements and the personalities of the history, and to stimulate him to read for himself. It abounds in citations from contemporary writers, and in details of a homely and graphic nature. We will mention in illustration the description given of Henry II. in a contemporary letter (p. 171), and the account of the daily life of the Earl of Northumberland (p. 329). Compare also the Anglo-Saxon list of months (p. 94) with its descriptive terms ("Windy-month," "Wine-month," etc.) with the *Pluviose* and *Fructidor* of the French Revolution.

It must be admitted that the author is not always happy in her citations, often giving us second-rate authorities where better were accessible. This fault is seen in the passing of judgments rather than the depicting of periods; contemporary writers are always welcome, but when it comes to telling us what people of another age have thought of a man or an institution we are entitled to the opinion of the persons best qualified to form one. We notice that, on page 453, Mary, Queen of Scots, is spoken of as undoubtedly implicated in the Babington plot; if we are not mistaken, the best evidence exculpates her from this. The book somewhat lacks proportion, fully two-thirds of it being taken up with mediæval history. We could not well wish this part shortened, and, on the other hand, to have entered with equal detail into modern events would have made the book inconveniently large. The modern portion, therefore, must be taken as hardly more than a sketch, and the reader must be content to give less time to the great civil war of the seventeenth century than to the blind fighting of the Wars of the Roses. This is certainly a fault, if an unavoidable one.

A Continental Tour of Eight Days, for Forty-four Shillings. By a Journeyman. (London: Sampson Low & Co.)—This eight days' tour implies several things besides those which it directly tells. A Journeyman who is so watchful of his health, and reckons up so soundly advantages and disadvantages that seem of small moment, has attained a kind of training which may be otherwise arrived at, but which is almost necessarily given by fixed, limited circumstances. He has about eleven dollars to spend for his "outing," and he weighs the exact amount of sea-air, variety, good food, and physical gain which he is to get for that sum. Any variation from the schedule is noted, any good hint is carefully booked, because next year again he will have but eleven dollars to spend, and he means to get the utmost out of it. The book hardly gives as many details as might be desirable (why not print the author's accounts?), and the journeyman hand appears in a want of grouping and perspective; but it is a good little book, and might well be helpful, if we Americans were not compelled to traverse so many leagues before we can reach variety, and if it were not assumed by those who provide for the public that quiet, cleanliness, and reasonable hours can only be desired by travelling millionaires.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Beedham (B. H.), List of Caxton Reproductions, swd.....	(Jonathan S. Green)
Fantasma: Poetry.....	(Ramsey, Millett & Hudson)
Fiske (J.), Darwinism, and Other Essays.....	(Macmillan & Co.) \$2 00
Fitzpatrick (W. J.), Life of Charles Lever, swd.....	(Harper & Bros.) 15
Freeman (E. A.), History of the Norman Conquest of England, Index Volume.....	(Macmillan & Co.) 2 50
Holtzendorff (Dr. F. von), Handbuch des deutschen Strafrechts, Vol. II., Part 3, swd.....	(L. W. Schmidt)
Wesen und Werth der öffentlichen Meinung, swd.....	(Gustav Himmer)
Tales of European Life, swd.....	(A. K. Loring) 15
Tollin (Rev. H.), Charakterbild Michael Servet's, swd.....	(L. W. Schmidt)
Yonge (Miss C. M.), History of France.....	(Henry Holt & Co.) 1 00

